



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 20, 2010

No. 77

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 20, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LORETTA SANCHEZ to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Roderick Lewis, Sr., Parkwood Institutional CME Church, Charlotte, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with thanksgiving we pray for the sustaining of our lives. May we be thankful for the creation which You have shared with us, as You are the Sovereign, Holy and Almighty God.

Grant wisdom and knowledge for the Members of this great body. May this cadre of leaders be sensitive to Your voice, to the people of America and to the world. We pray for President Barack Obama, the House of Representatives, the Senate floor, and all governmental leaders.

Lord, we pray for the men and women serving in our Armed Forces, for their protection and for their families as they serve on distant shores. Continue to be a guiding light to those who have lost loved ones in the defense of our Nation.

May each person here find wisdom to conduct the people's business so to be pleasing to You. In the precious name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WATT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 920. An act to amend section 11317 of title 40, United States Code, to improve the transparency of the status of information technology investments, to require greater accountability for cost overruns on Federal information technology investment projects, to improve the processes agencies implement to manage information technology investments, to reward excellence in information technology acquisition, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING REVEREND DR. RODERICK D. LEWIS, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman WATT, is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WATT. Madam Speaker, I am honored to welcome Reverend Dr. Roderick D. Lewis, Sr., as the guest chap-

lain for the United States House of Representatives for today. Since July of 2001, Reverend Dr. Lewis has served as pastor of Parkwood Institutional CME Church which is located in my congressional district in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Reverend Dr. Lewis is a native of Columbia, South Carolina. He received his bachelor of social work from Livingstone College, also in my congressional district, his master of divinity from Howard University's School of Divinity, and his doctor of ministry from Hood Theological Seminary. He is an active member of the community and has served as a clinical social worker with the W.G. Hefner VA Medical Center in Salisbury, North Carolina, which is also in my congressional district, and with the South Carolina Department of Mental Health.

On behalf of my constituents in the 12th Congressional District and my colleagues here in the House, I thank Reverend Dr. Lewis for his service to his community and for his prayer today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of Mexico, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to her left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3661

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, May 13, 2010, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at 10:53 a.m., the following proceedings were had:

JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY FELIPE CALDERON HINOJOSA, PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Majority Floor Services Chief, Mr. Barry Sullivan, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of Mexico, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN);

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR);

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR);

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER);

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN); and

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Sen-

ators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of Mexico, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);
The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN); and

The Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON).

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Faida Mitifu, Ambassador of the Democratic Republic of Congo.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

The Majority Floor Services Chief announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 12 minutes a.m., the Majority Floor Services Chief announced His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of Mexico.

The President of Mexico, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of Mexico.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

President CALDERON. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Honorable Members of Congress, and as we say in Mexico, amigas y amigos Congressistas, it's a great honor to stand before you today. I would like to thank Congress and the American people for this invitation. I want to express my gratitude to all of you here who have supported Mexico during very challenging times. I also salute the Mexican Americans and all Latinos who work every day for the prosperity of this great Nation.

Mexico is a young country but a very old nation. Our roots go back thousands of years. However, this year is especially significant for us. We are celebrating the bicentennial of our

independence, 200 years of being proudly free and proudly Mexican. At that time, Mexico was the first nation to abolish slavery in the whole of continental America. And it is exactly 100 years since the Mexican Revolution, a revolution against oppression, a revolution for justice and democracy. As you can see, Mexico was founded on the same values and principles as the United States of America. We are very proud of this past. However, the Mexican people and the government are focused on the future. That is why Mexico is a country in a continuous process of transformation. We are determined to change, and we are taking the decisions that are going to make Mexico a more prosperous democracy.

One of the main changes taking place in Mexico is our commitment to firmly establish the rule of law. That is why we are deploying the full force of the State to confront organized crime with determination and courage. But let me explain. This fight is not only and not mainly about stopping the drug trade. It is first and foremost a drive to guarantee the security of Mexican families who are under threat from the abuses and the vicious acts of criminals. As I told the Mexican people in my inaugural speech, restoring public security will not be easy and will not be quick. It will take time; it will take money; and unfortunately, to our deep sorrow, it will take human lives as well. This is a battle that has to be fought because the future of our families is at stake. But I told them then, you can be sure of one thing: This is a battle that, united, we, the Mexican people, will win.

We cannot ignore the fact that the challenge to our security has roots on both sides of the border. At the end of the day, its origin is the high demand for drugs here and in other places. Secretary of State Clinton has said, "We accept our share of the responsibility. We know that the demand for drugs drives much of this illicit trade." This is symbolic of our new relationship. We have moved from the suspicion and the mutual recrimination of the past to the cooperation and mutual understanding of the present.

Let me take this opportunity to congratulate President Obama for his recent initiative to reduce the consumption of drugs. I hope, for the good of both nations and the entire hemisphere, that this succeeds. Now let me tell you what Mexico is doing to confront and overcome this problem. First, we have not hesitated to use all the power of the State, including the federal police and the armed forces, in order to support the local governments that are facing the greatest threat from organized crime. This is a temporary measure to restore order. The goal is to provide local governments time and the opportunity to rebuild and strengthen their security and judicial institutions. Second, we are weakening the financial and operational capabilities of criminal gangs. Federal

operations have led to record seizures of drugs, cash, and weapons from the criminals. We are hitting them, and we are hitting them hard. The federal forces have also arrested many important felons who are now facing Mexican justice, and we have extradited a record number of criminals to face justice here in the United States. Third, we are rebuilding our institutions and security forces, especially at the federal level. We have more than tripled the federal police budget since the beginning of my administration and multiplied the size of its force. We are recruiting honest young men and women with values who are better trained, better paid, and better equipped. Fourth, we are transforming our judicial system to make it more transparent and efficient. We are moving towards open and oral trials that are the basis of your own judicial system. And fifth, we have set up social programs to prevent young people from turning to crime, including prevention and treatment for addictions. As you can see, we are doing everything we can to fight this threat and to secure our common future.

We are fulfilling our duty as a good neighbor, taking care of business on our side of the border. The U.S. is also helping. Congress approved the Merida Initiative, which we greatly appreciate, and our administrations are sharing more information than ever to fight crime. However, there is one issue where Mexico needs your cooperation, and that is stopping the flow of assault weapons and other deadly arms across the border. Let me be clear on this. I fully respect, I admire the American Constitution, and I understand that the purpose of the Second Amendment is to guarantee good American citizens the ability to defend themselves and their Nation. But believe me, many of these guns are not going to honest American hands. Instead, thousands are ending up in the hands of criminals. Just to give you an idea, we have seized 75,000 guns and assault weapons in Mexico in the last 3 years, and more than 80 percent of those we have been able to trace came from the United States. And if you look carefully, you will notice that the violence in Mexico started to grow a couple of years before I took office in 2006. This coincides with the lifting of the assault weapons ban in 2004. One day, criminals in Mexico, having gained access to these weapons, decided to challenge the authorities in my country. Today, these weapons are aimed by the criminals not only at rival gangs but also at Mexican civilians and authorities. And with all due respect, if you do not regulate the sale of these weapons in the right way, nothing guarantees that criminals here in the United States with access to the same power of weapons will not decide to challenge the American authorities and civilians.

It is true that the U.S. Government is now carrying out operations against gun traffickers. But it is also true that

there are more than 7,000 gun shops along the border with Mexico, where almost anyone can purchase these powerful weapons. I also fully understand the political sensitivity of this issue. But I would ask Congress to help us, with respect, and to understand how important it is for us that you enforce current laws to stem the supply of these weapons to criminals and consider reinstating the assault weapons ban. By any legal way that you consider, let us work together to end this lethal trade that threatens Mexico and your own people.

I have spoken at length on this issue, about security, because I know it is a big concern of the American people. However, as I said, Mexico is a country undergoing deep transformations, and our relationship is about much more than just security. We are turning our economy into one that is competitive and strong, capable of generating the jobs Mexicans need. I believe in freedom. I believe in market. I believe in all those principles that are able to empower economies and provide well-being for the people.

We are carrying out a set of structural reforms that had been ignored for decades in Mexico. We started, for instance, by reforming the public pension system, and with this, we guaranteed the retirement of public servants, and at the same time, we will save 30 points of GDP at net present value in our public finances. We passed a tax reform that reduced our dependence on oil and allowed us to continue financing our development, keeping our public deficit close to 1 percent of GDP. We also made important changes to the oil sector. This will allow Pemex, the public oil company, to award more flexible contracts to specialized global companies and so become more efficient and increase its operational and financial capacity in order to get more oil and natural gas. This will ensure our energy independence and strengthen regional energy security as well. And finally, we have increased investment in infrastructure from 3 points of GDP to 5 points of GDP a year, building the roads, ports, airports, and energy plants we need to modernize. This is the highest investment level in infrastructure in decades. These changes are making us a more modern country and a stronger partner of the United States.

The energy reform, the fiscal reform, the pension reform, the investment in infrastructure, among others, have all prepared us for a better tomorrow but also allowed us to overcome the terrible economic crisis last year. Then, Mexico's economy experienced its worst contraction in modern times. However, thanks to strong regulations, not one cent from taxpayers went to a single bank in Mexico last year. We were also able to quickly implement countercyclical measures, such as a temporary public works program and increased credits for small businesses. In this way, we were able to save hun-

dreds of thousands of Mexican jobs. We managed this even though we had to face a series of emergencies, any one of which would have derailed a weaker country. We faced the perfect storm last year. Besides the crisis, we overcame the second worst drought in 70 years, the biggest ever drop in oil production, and the outbreak of the H1N1 flu virus. So today I can come here before you and say with confidence that Mexico is standing tall, a stronger and more determined nation than ever, a nation and a people ready to face the future and take their rightful place in the world. And the future starts now, now that the Mexican economy is recovering.

So far this year, Mexico has created more than 400,000 new jobs, which is the highest number ever created in a 4-month period in Mexico. In the first quarter, the Mexican economy grew 4.3 percent, and we are expecting to grow more than 4 percent this year in our economy, which means, among other things, more well-being for our people and more Mexicans buying more American products. We have made structural reforms to modernize our economy, and we want more. Today our Congress is debating stronger antitrust regulation as well as new labor legislation that will provide more opportunities for women and young people. And my government is auctioning both wireless frequencies and an optic fiber backbone in order to increase competition and coverage in telecoms. Mexico is on the right track towards development now.

As well as promoting economic progress, we are improving the quality of life of all Mexicans under the principle of equal opportunities for all. Thanks to Oportunidades, an advanced poverty relief program, Mexico was able to reduce the number of people living in extreme poverty from 35 million in 1996 to 14 million in 2006. This program reaches the 6 million poorest families, which means one in four Mexicans. Equal opportunity means more and better education, and we have provided scholarships to 6 million poor children of all ages. At the same time, we are investing more than ever in free public universities. And today, almost 90,000 students graduate as engineers and technicians every year in my country. We want all our young people to have the chance to study. Equal opportunity means access to health services for everyone. We have tripled the budget for Popular Health Insurance and rebuilt or renovated 1,700 public hospitals and clinics in 3 years, more than one a day. This will allow us to reach a goal any nation would be proud of, universal health coverage by 2012. A doctor, medicine, and treatment for any Mexican that needs it. Equal opportunity means more and better education, cutting-edge poverty fighting programs, and universal health coverage. By improving opportunities for all, we are giving people one less reason to leave Mexico.

As you can see, Mexico is a country in transformation. This is making us an even more strategic partner for the future prosperity of the American people. The world is more global and more interconnected every day. It is also divided into large economic regions. Those regions that maximize their comparative advantages will be the ones that succeed. And we both need to compete with Asia and with Europe. Mexico and the United States are stronger together than they are apart. Our economic ties have made both economies stronger, and together, we can renew our partnership to restore stronger and faster economic growth on both sides of the border. A stronger Mexico means a stronger United States. Let us not forget, Mexicans are the second-largest foreign buyers of American goods in the world. And a stronger United States, of course, means a stronger Mexico. So I invite you to work with Mexico and consolidate North America as the most competitive region in the world. I believe in that. Let us create more jobs for American workers and more jobs for Mexican workers.

Members of Congress, I am not a President who likes to see Mexicans leave our country searching for opportunities abroad. With migration, our communities lose their best people, the hardest working, the most dynamic, the leaders of the communities. Each migrant is a parent who will never see his children again.

Quiero decirles a los migrantes, a quienes estan trabajando aqui por la grandeza de este pais, que los admiramos, que los extranamos, que estamos luchando por sus derechos y que estamos trabajando duro por Mexico y por sus familias.

I want to say to the migrants, all those who are working really hard for this great country that we admire them, we miss them, we are working hard for their rights, and we are working really hard for Mexico and for the families. Today we are doing the best we can do in order to reduce migration, to create opportunities, and to create jobs for Mexicans in our own country, where their homes are and where their families are. As many jobs as we can. And Mexico will one day be a country in which our people will find the opportunities that today they look for outside of the country. Until then, Mexico is determined to assume its responsibility. For us, migration is not just your problem. We see migration as our problem as well.

My government does not favor the breaking of the rules. I fully respect the right of any country to enact and enforce its own laws. But what we need today is to fix a broken and inefficient system. We favor the establishment of laws that work and work well for us all. So the time has come for the United States and Mexico to work together on this issue. The time has come to reduce the causes of migration and to turn this phenomenon into one

of legal, ordered, and secure flows of workers and visitors. We want to provide the Mexican people with the opportunities they are looking for. That is our goal, that is our mission as government; to transform Mexico into a land of opportunities, to provide our people with jobs and opportunities, to live in peace and to be happy.

I want to recognize the hard work and leadership of many of you in the Senate, and in the House, and of President Obama, who are determined to find responsible and objective answers to this issue. I am convinced that comprehensive immigration reform is also crucial to secure our common border. However, I strongly disagree with the recently adopted law in Arizona. It is a law that not only ignores a reality that cannot be erased by decree but also introduces a terrible idea: using racial profiling as a basis for law enforcement. And that is why I agree with President Obama, who said the new law “carries a great amount of risk when core values that we all care about are breached.” I want to bridge the gap of feelings and emotions between our countries and our peoples. I believe in this. I believe in communications, I believe in cooperation, and we together must find a better way to face and fix this common problem.

And finally, the well-being of both our peoples depends not only on our ability to face regional challenges but global ones as well. That is the case of climate change. That is the case, for instance, of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. Climate change is one of humanity’s most pressing threats. Global warming demands the commitment of all nations, both developed and developing countries. That is why Mexico was the first developing country to commit to emissions reduction targets and programs. As host of the upcoming COP 16, we are working hard to make progress in the fight against climate change. Because of your global leadership, we will need your support to make the meeting in Cancun next November a success.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Honorable Members of the United States Congress, Mexico is a country in deep transformation, indeed. We are building the future our people deserve, a future of opportunity, a future of freedom, of equality, of the rule of law, a future of security in which families and children can go out to work, study, and play without fear, and most of all, a future in which our children and their children will see their dreams come true. I have come here as your neighbor, as your partner, as your ally, and as your friend. Our two great nations are joined by geography and by history, but more important, we are joined by a shared brilliant future. I believe in the future of North America as the strongest, most prosperous region in the world. That is possible.

President Franklin Roosevelt once said that “the only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts

of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.” And I say, let us work together with a strong and active faith in order to give our people the future they deserve.

Thank you very much for your invitation. God bless America. Viva Mexico.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o’clock and 52 minutes a.m., His Excellency Felipe Calderon Hinojosa, President of Mexico, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Majority Floor Services Chief escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President’s Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, (at 11 o’clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at 1 o’clock and 1 minute p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to ten 1-minute per side.

DEPENDENT CARE COVERAGE EXPANSION

(Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 the largest private employer in

the State of Connecticut, United Technologies Corporation, announced a decision to implement dependent coverage up to age 26 for their 30,000 employees and families. They took advantage of an IRS ruling which was issued April 23 to implement this change, which will make a huge difference for adult children of their workforce.

Too often at commencement ceremonies, which are taking place all across the country, kids are given a diploma and then a notice that they are coming off their parents' health insurance plan. With the health insurance reform bill, this is now a thing of the past, and UTC has set a great example for employers all across the country to implement this change as soon as possible.

Yesterday, Mohegan Sun Casino, with 10,000 employees, issued the same decision for its employees. This is going to make a difference for families and adult children. I spoke to a mother of a 22-year-old who has been hospitalized numerous times, and she was in tears. She was so excited that her daughter will be able to continue to receive the care that she needs, which otherwise would never have been available if we had not passed the health care reform bill.

STOP BAILING OUT COUNTRIES, STATES, AND COMPANIES

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, recently the IMF announced a giant bailout to keep Greece from defaulting, defaulting on its own debt, debt for its socialistic economy. The U.S. is the largest contributor to the IMF; therefore, we are the largest bailout source for this. That's right, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. taxpayer is now in the business of rescuing Greece from its debt crisis, which was brought on by reckless borrowing and spending to fund welfare programs.

While the U.S. is putting itself on the hook for another bailout, liberals in Washington are working hard to copycat the Greek model: taxing, spending, borrowing, and increasing entitlement programs across the board. Behind Greece are other European countries on the verge of default. Are we going to bail them out, too? And that's not to mention States like California and the many companies this government has already bailed out. Who will bail out our country when we can't borrow our way out of trouble?

Mr. Speaker, let's stop bailing out countries, States, and companies, and hold all entities, including ourselves, accountable for runaway spending.

PASS WALL STREET REFORM

(Ms. MARKEY of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this Con-

gress to pass meaningful Wall Street reform to protect American taxpayers from ever again being forced to bail out Wall Street banks. It's time to end "too big to fail" financial firms whose irresponsible behavior almost crashed our entire economy. And it's time to end predatory lending practices with tougher enforcement.

We must pass a bill that will end bailouts and ensure that banks and taxpayers are never again on the hook for Wall Street's risky gambles. We must act to protect families' retirement funds, college savings, homes, and small businesses, and bring transparency and accountability back to a financial system run amok.

I wasn't in Congress while some Wall Street banks were running our financial system into the ground, but I came here to clean up the mess and get America's economy back on track. So I ask my colleagues, whose side do you stand on? Do you stand with the reckless Wall Street banks or will you stand with American families? I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

FLORIDA IS STILL OPEN FOR BUSINESS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the U.S. Coast Guard announced that the tar balls discovered on the Florida Keys shoreline were not linked to the gulf oil spill. What does this mean? It means that Florida is still open for business.

Mr. Speaker, public beaches in my congressional district of Miami Beach and the Florida Keys are open. Their waters are warm and inviting. Charter boat captains eagerly await the opportunity to take tourists deep sea fishing. Similarly, dive shops stand by to take visitors on a tour of some of the greatest underwater treasures in this world, the Florida Keys coral reef.

For those outside of Florida, it is important to note that fresh-caught fish from our Sunshine State is just as fresh as ever, as are our stone crabs, spiny lobster, and shrimp. Recent news reports have caused a premature panic for visitors. And while it is important that coastal communities prepare for the possibility of oil coming ashore, Florida is open for business.

Come on down; the water's fine.

ARIZONA'S MISGUIDED LAW

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, America's immigration system is broken. Congress' failure to act has opened the doors for laws like Arizona SB 1070 that are inspired by hate and racism. Sadly, this misguided law hurts everyone who looks different, whether they are American citizens, lawful immigrants, or undocumented immigrants.

Everyone deserves the right to live free from unwarranted suspicion, but Arizona SB 1070 legalizes racial profiling, taking away our basic freedoms.

Later today, I will introduce legislation in the House to fight this law that clarifies the role of the Federal Government as the sole enforcer of immigration laws.

I urge all of you who value fairness and justice to join me in an economic boycott of Arizona and wear a red and yellow wristband in opposing this hateful law.

YOUNG CUT

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, every day all across America right now families are sitting down at the dinner table trying to figure out how to make ends meet. Many of them have lost their jobs. Others have seen that their mortgage payments have gone up, their utility costs are going up. And you know what they are having to do? They are having to sit down and revise their budget. They are trying to figure out instead of taking a vacation if they need to go and fix the car.

What we have seen is the American people are realizing that you can't borrow and spend, borrow and spend, that someday there is a day of reckoning. And they are wondering why their government hasn't figured that out.

Last week, Republicans gave the American people an opportunity to voice their opinion about whether we should cut expenses or not; 280,000 people said we should start cutting spending. And they are going to be given an opportunity this week to express themselves as well.

Mr. Speaker, what they wonder is why Congress doesn't get the message. We saw today that the jobless rate is up to 471,000 people. People are out of work, Mr. Speaker. We need to get Americans back to work and we need to cut the spending. We need to listen to the American people.

THE SMALL BUSINESS INTERMEDIARY LENDING PILOT ACT

(Ms. KILROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KILROY. Mr. Speaker, when I talk to people in my community, the thing that they are most concerned about are jobs and the economy. When we took office, when I was sworn in last January, we were losing jobs at an atrocious rate, over 600,000 jobs per month. Now we are seeing months of job growth and adding jobs to our economy. That's the good news.

We must continue to stay on this pathway. That's why I have supported bills like the HIRE Act to help employers add more people to their businesses, and recently filed the Small Business

Intermediary Lending Pilot Act so that people who are starting businesses and need smaller loans, in that gap between \$35,000 and \$200,000, that there can be a pilot program to set that in motion. Because when I talk to people and business people in the community, the one thing that they tell me that they really need is access to credit and access to capital.

The Small Business Intermediary Lending Pilot Act will help that. And another bill that we are working on in our Financial Services Committee, putting money into community banks to make loans to business, small business, will do just that.

READ THE ARIZONA LAW

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, administration officials are criticizing Arizona's new illegal immigration enforcement law, and they haven't read the bill. The Attorney General hasn't read it. The Secretary of Homeland Security hasn't read it. Some State Department radical compared the Arizona law to human rights violations in China, but he hadn't read the bill either. But that hasn't stopped them all from criticizing the Arizona law they know nothing about.

Mexico President Calderon spoke here today and lectured us on our illegal immigration laws. He said the Arizona law opens the door to racial profiling. If the President had read the law he would know it does nothing of the sort. In fact, in four places the law prohibits any profiling.

I wonder if President Calderon has read the law he has been criticizing. It doesn't appear he has read his own country's tough illegal immigration laws either, but he takes the time to arrogantly denounce our laws. All of these critics don't want the truth of the law to get in the way of their indignant demagoguery and political agenda.

And that's just the way it is.

IN TRIBUTE TO SGT NATHAN KENNEDY

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American hero. On April 27, the Kennedy family in the Town of Claysville, Pennsylvania, in my district, lost a son and a brother. Sergeant Nathan Kennedy was less than a month away from completing his second tour with the U.S. Army when he was fatally wounded by enemy sniper fire in Afghanistan.

Nathan Kennedy was a 2004 graduate of McGuffey High School, where he excelled as a champion wrestler. In 2006, he enlisted in the Army, and served in Iraq and Afghanistan. Sadly, he was

killed in battle on his late mother Penelope's birthday, and Nathan was laid to rest beside her this past Mother's Day.

While Sergeant Kennedy returned a few weeks too early, he returned to a grateful group of friends and neighbors standing along the flag-lined streets of Claysville to honor his sacrifice. In joining the procession, I will never forget the overwhelming solemn presence of that silent crowd. Not a sound was made during Sergeant Kennedy's procession, none but for the strut of the team of horses that pulled the caisson carrying his flag-draped coffin.

Although our hearts are heavy in remembrance of Nathan, we may rejoice, because while the small town of Claysville has lost a son, a grateful Nation has gained a hero.

□ 1315

"INTELLIGENT TALK" IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform our colleagues that common sense has come to Washington, D.C., at least by way of the airwaves. WRC 1260 is now offering "Intelligent Talk," which includes people like Bill Bennett, Michael Medved, Hugh Hewitt, Dennis Prager, and more.

And we all know that with the 24-hour news cycle, bloggers, talk radio, satellite radio, Facebook, and YouTube, there's no shortage of commentary out there at all. But these hosts are consistently thoughtful voices for sound public policy. They have built large audiences and broad respect not by being the loudest or most outrageous, but by consistently offering reasoned sound analysis and positive center-right solutions.

Some might think that "Intelligent Talk" in Washington, D.C., was an idea whose time would never come. Thanks to Bennett, Hewitt, Prager, Medved, and more, there is a little more common sense kicking around now in our Nation's Capital.

THE NEED TO EXTEND THE SHORT LINE RAILROAD REHABILITATION TAX CREDIT

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, investing in transportation and infrastructure is one of the best ways to put people back to work while increasing our global competitiveness. These investments must be made not just publicly but also by private companies. So we need to support policies that encourage private investment.

One such policy is the Short Line Railroad Rehabilitation Tax Credit,

which has been critical in boosting private investment in rail infrastructure. In Chicagoland, which suffers greatly from rail congestion, this credit has been put to good use by railroads such as the Belt Railway Company and the Indiana Harbor Belt. These railroads have made improvements that reduce congestion, boosting local business competitiveness and easing traffic on the roads.

Unfortunately, this credit expired at the end of last year. So we must act now. Let's help put people to work and improve American transportation and enhance and extend the short line tax credit.

COSTA MESA, A "RULE OF LAW" CITY

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise the courageous and responsible stand taken by the city of Costa Mesa. In stark contrast to the municipalities that have declared themselves sanctuary cities, Costa Mesa, under the leadership of Mayor Allen Mansour, has declared itself a "rule of law" city, a city where citizens and law enforcement will support, rather than undermine, our efforts to deter and enforce our immigration laws.

I am proud to represent Costa Mesa and, yes, to reside in that city. It follows Arizona in its efforts to protect the interests of the American people from the municipality up. This isn't just a job for the United States Government.

Today the citizens of the United States see their well-being threatened, whether it's their education, their health care, or the criminal justice systems on which they depend undermined by this massive, out-of-control flow of illegals into our country.

I praise those people who are taking a stand there locally, whether it's Costa Mesa or Arizona, and I think we should be taking a cue from them to do our job in Washington to watch out for the interests of the American people.

NATIONAL MEDIA IGNORE NEWS STORIES THEY DON'T LIKE

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, here are a few recent examples of the national media ignoring stories they don't like.

Number one, Attorney General Eric Holder has criticized Arizona's new immigration enforcement law and may file suit against it. However, during a Judiciary Committee hearing last week, the Attorney General admitted he had not even read the law. The national media largely ignored his admission.

Number two, the City of Los Angeles recently voted to boycott the State of Arizona because of its new immigration law. A Los Angeles Times online poll found that more than 9 out of 10 respondents opposed the city's boycott. The L.A. Times ignored their own poll results.

Number three, hundreds of scientists gathered this week at an international conference to discuss the scientific problems with the theory of human-caused global warming. The media largely ignored the conference.

The national media should report all of the facts, not just the ones that support their liberal agenda.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO STRENGTHEN FOREIGN STUDENT VISA SECURITY

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, recent events have highlighted gaps in our student visa laws that can be exploited by terrorists who attempt to enter our country under false pretenses and then disappear as they plot to attack us.

Earlier this year, the Department of Homeland Security disrupted schemes involving individuals holding student visas despite their violation of the terms. In addition, the recent Times Square bomber reportedly first entered the United States on a student visa in 1998. On top of that, several of the 9/11 hijackers had violated the terms of their student visas.

Foreign students play an important role in our society, but we must ensure that terrorists do not use our student visa process as a back door into our country. The need to improve the system is clear.

I introduced the Student Visa Security Improvement Act in order to improve screening of foreign students before they enter the U.S. and to ensure that they abide by the terms of their visa once they are here. Congress must act now to strengthen student visa security and pass H.R. 5208.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 5327, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 1256, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 1336, de novo;

House Resolution 1361, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL MISSILE DEFENSE COOPERATION AND SUPPORT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5327, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCMAHON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5327, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 4, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—410

Ackerman	Clarke	Grayson
Aderholt	Clay	Green, Al
Adler (NJ)	Cleaver	Green, Gene
Akin	Clyburn	Griffith
Alexander	Coble	Grijalva
Altmire	Coffman (CO)	Guthrie
Andrews	Cohen	Gutierrez
Arcuri	Cole	Hall (NY)
Austria	Conaway	Hall (TX)
Baca	Connolly (VA)	Halvorson
Bachmann	Cooper	Hare
Baird	Costa	Harman
Baldwin	Costello	Harper
Barrow	Courtney	Hastings (FL)
Bartlett	Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)
Barton (TX)	Crowley	Heinrich
Bean	Cuellar	Heller
Becerra	Culberson	Hensarling
Berkley	Cummings	Henger
Berman	Dahlkemper	Herseth Sandlin
Berry	Davis (AL)	Higgins
Biggert	Davis (CA)	Hill
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Hinchey
Bishop (NY)	Davis (TN)	Hinojosa
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Hirono
Blackburn	DeGette	Hodes
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Holden
Blunt	DeLauro	Holt
Bocchieri	Dent	Honda
Boehner	Deutch	Hoyer
Bono Mack	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hunter
Boozman	Dicks	Inglis
Boren	Dingell	Inslee
Boswell	Doggett	Israel
Boucher	Donnelly (IN)	Issa
Boustany	Doyle	Jackson (IL)
Boyd	Dreier	Jenkins
Brady (PA)	Driehaus	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Edwards (MD)	Johnson, Sam
Bright	Edwards (TX)	Jones
Broun (GA)	Ehlers	Jordan (OH)
Brown (SC)	Ellison	Kagen
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Kanjorski
Brown-Waite,	Emerson	Kaptur
Ginny	Eshoo	Kennedy
Buchanan	Etheridge	Kildee
Burgess	Fallin	Kilpatrick (MI)
Burton (IN)	Farr	Kilroy
Butterfield	Fattah	Kind
Buyer	Filner	King (IA)
Calvert	Flake	King (NY)
Camp	Fleming	Kingston
Campbell	Forbes	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Cantor	Fortenberry	Kissell
Cao	Foster	Klein (FL)
Capito	Fox	Kline (MN)
Capps	Frank (MA)	Kosmas
Capuano	Franks (AZ)	Kratovil
Cardoza	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Carnahan	Fudge	Lance
Carney	Gallegly	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Larsen (WA)
Carter	Gerlach	Larson (CT)
Cassidy	Giffords	Latham
Castle	Gingrey (GA)	LaTourette
Castor (FL)	Gohmert	Latta
Chaffetz	Gonzalez	Lee (CA)
Chandler	Goodlatte	Lee (NY)
Childers	Granger	Levin
Chu	Graves	Lewis (CA)

Lewis (GA)	Nye	Serrano
Linder	Oberstar	Sessions
Lipinski	Obey	Sestak
LoBiondo	Olson	Shadegg
Loeb sack	Olver	Shea-Porter
Lofgren, Zoe	Ortiz	Sherman
Lowey	Owens	Shimkus
Lucas	Pallone	Shuler
Luetkemeyer	Pascarell	Shuster
Lujan	Pastor (AZ)	Simpson
Lummis	Paulsen	Sires
Lungren, Daniel	Payne	Skelton
E.	Pence	Slaughter
Lynch	Perlmutter	Smith (NE)
Mack	Perriello	Smith (NJ)
Maffei	Peters	Smith (TX)
Maloney	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Manzullo	Petri	Snyder
Marchant	Pingree (ME)	Space
Markey (CO)	Pitts	Speier
Markey (MA)	Platts	Spratt
Marshall	Poe (TX)	Stearns
Matheson	Polis (CO)	Stupak
Matsui	Pomeroy	Sullivan
McCarthy (CA)	Posey	Sutton
McCarthy (NY)	Price (GA)	Tanner
McCaul	Price (NC)	Taylor
McClintock	Putnam	Teague
McCollum	Quigley	Terry
McCotter	Radanovich	Thompson (CA)
McDermott	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Rangel	Thompson (PA)
McHenry	Rehberg	Thornberry
McIntyre	Reichert	Tiahrt
McKeon	Reyes	Tiberi
McMahon	Richardson	Tierney
McMorris	Rodriguez	Titus
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Tonko
McNerney	Rogers (AL)	Towns
Meek (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Tsongas
Meeks (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Turner
Melancon	Rohrabacher	Upton
Mica	Rooney	Van Hollen
Michaud	Ros-Lehtinen	Velázquez
Miller (FL)	Roskam	Visclosky
Miller (MI)	Ross	Walden
Miller (NC)	Rothman (NJ)	Walz
Miller, Gary	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Miller, George	Royce	Schultz
Minnick	Ruppersberger	Waters
Mitchell	Rush	Watson
Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Watt
Moore (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Waxman
Moore (WI)	Salazar	Weiner
Moran (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch
Moran (VA)	Sarbanes	Westmoreland
Murphy (CT)	Scalise	Whitfield
Murphy (NY)	Schakowsky	Wilson (OH)
Murphy, Patrick	Schauer	Wilson (SC)
Murphy, Tim	Schiff	Wittman
Myrick	Schmidt	Wolf
Nadler (NY)	Schrader	Woolsey
Napolitano	Schwartz	Wu
Neal (MA)	Scott (GA)	Yarmuth
Neugebauer	Scott (VA)	Young (AK)
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Conyers
Kucinich

Paul
Stark

NOT VOTING—16

Bachus	Garamendi	Kirk
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Sánchez, Linda
Bilbray	Hoekstra	T.
Bonner	Jackson Lee	Schock
Diaz-Balart, M.	(TX)	Souder
Engel	Johnson (GA)	Wamp

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1348

Mr. McDERMOTT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 284 I was detained at a luncheon honoring the President of Mexico, since I am Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Committee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and was unable to get back to the vote on time. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CONGRATULATING PHIL MICKELSON ON WINNING 2010 MASTERS GOLF TOURNAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1256, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1256.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 0, answered "present" 8, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]
YEAS—401

Ackerman	Capps	Etheridge
Aderholt	Capuano	Fallin
Adler (NJ)	Cardoza	Farr
Akin	Carnahan	Fattah
Alexander	Carney	Filner
Altmire	Carson (IN)	Flake
Andrews	Carter	Fleming
Arcuri	Castle	Forbes
Austria	Castor (FL)	Fortenberry
Baca	Chandler	Foster
Bachmann	Childers	Fox
Baird	Chu	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Clarke	Franks (AZ)
Barrow	Clay	Frelighuysen
Bartlett	Cleaver	Fudge
Barton (TX)	Clyburn	Gallegly
Bean	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Becerra	Coffman (CO)	Gerlach
Berkley	Cohen	Giffords
Berman	Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Biggart	Conaway	Gohmert
Billirakis	Connolly (VA)	Gonzalez
Bishop (GA)	Conyers	Goodlatte
Bishop (NY)	Cooper	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Costa	Graves
Blackburn	Costello	Grayson
Blumenauer	Courtney	Green, Gene
Blunt	Crenshaw	Griffith
Boccieri	Crowley	Grijalva
Boehner	Cuellar	Guthrie
Bono Mack	Culberson	Gutierrez
Boozman	Cummings	Hall (NY)
Boren	Dahlkemper	Hall (TX)
Boswell	Davis (AL)	Halvorson
Boucher	Davis (CA)	Hare
Boustany	Davis (IL)	Harman
Boyd	Davis (KY)	Harper
Brady (PA)	Davis (TN)	Hastings (FL)
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Braley (IA)	Delahunt	Heinrich
Bright	DeLauro	Heller
Broun (GA)	Dent	Hensarling
Brown (SC)	Deutch	Heger
Brown, Corrine	Diaz-Balart, L.	Herseth Sandlin
Brown-Waite,	Dicks	Higgins
Ginny	Dingell	Hill
Buchanan	Doggett	Himes
Burgess	Donnelly (IN)	Hinche
Burton (IN)	Doyle	Hinojosa
Butterfield	Dreier	Hirono
Buyer	Driebehaus	Hodes
Calvert	Duncan	Holden
Camp	Edwards (MD)	Holt
Campbell	Ellison	Honda
Cantor	Ellsworth	Hoyer
Cao	Emerson	Hunter
Capito	Eshoo	Inglis

Inslee	Meeks (NY)	Salazar
Israel	Melancon	Sanchez, Loretta
Issa	Mica	Sarbanes
Jackson (IL)	Michaud	Scalise
Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Schakowsky
Johnson (GA)	Miller (MI)	Schauer
Johnson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Schiff
Johnson, E. B.	Miller, Gary	Schmidt
Johnson, Sam	Miller, George	Schock
Jones	Minnick	Schrader
Jordan (OH)	Mitchell	Scott (GA)
Kagen	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kanjorski	Moore (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Kaptur	Moore (WI)	Serrano
Kennedy	Moran (KS)	Sessions
Kildee	Moran (VA)	Sestak
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murphy (CT)	Shadegg
Kilroy	Murphy (NY)	Shea-Porter
Kind	Murphy, Patrick	Sherman
King (IA)	Murphy, Tim	Shimkus
King (NY)	Myrick	Shuler
Kingston	Nadler (NY)	Shuster
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Napolitano	Simpson
Kissell	Neal (MA)	Sires
Klein (FL)	Neugebauer	Skelton
Kline (MN)	Nunes	Slaughter
Kosmas	Nye	Smith (NE)
Kratovil	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Kucinich	Olson	Smith (TX)
Lamborn	Olver	Smith (WA)
Lance	Ortiz	Snyder
Langevin	Owens	Space
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Speier
Larson (CT)	Pascarell	Spratt
Latham	Pastor (AZ)	Stark
LaTourette	Paul	Stearns
Latta	Paulsen	Stupak
Lee (CA)	Payne	Sullivan
Lee (NY)	Pence	Sutton
Levin	Perlmutter	Tanner
Lewis (CA)	Perriello	Taylor
Lewis (GA)	Peters	Teague
Linder	Peterson	Terry
Lipinski	Petri	Thompson (CA)
LoBiondo	Pingree (ME)	Thompson (MS)
Loeb	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
Lofgren, Zoe	Platts	Thornberry
Lowe	Poe (TX)	Tiahrt
Lucas	Polis (CO)	Tiberi
Luetkemeyer	Pomeroy	Tierney
Lujan	Posey	Titus
Lungren, Daniel	Price (GA)	Tonko
E.	Price (NC)	Towns
Lynch	Putnam	Tsongas
Mack	Quigley	Turner
Maffei	Radanovich	Upton
Maloney	Rahall	Van Hollen
Manzullo	Rangel	Velázquez
Marchant	Rehberg	Visclosky
Markey (CO)	Reichert	Walden
Matheson	Reyes	Walz
Matsui	Richardson	Wasserman
McCarthy (CA)	Rodriguez	Schultz
McCarthy (NY)	Roe (TN)	Waters
McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Watson
McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Watt
McCollum	Rogers (MI)	Weiner
McCotter	Rohrabacher	Welch
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
McGovern	Roskam	Whitfield
McHenry	Ross	Wilson (OH)
McIntyre	Rothman (NJ)	Wilson (SC)
McKeon	Roybal-Allard	Wittman
McMahon	Royce	Wolf
McMorris	Ruppersberger	Woolsey
Rodgers	Rush	Wu
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
Meek (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8

Berry	DeFazio
Cassidy	Lummis
Chaffetz	Marshall

NOT VOTING—21

Bachus	Garamendi	Sánchez, Linda
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	T.
Bilbray	Green, Al	Schwartz
Bonner	Hoekstra	Souder
Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson Lee	Wamp
Edwards (TX)	(TX)	Waxman
Ehlers	Kirk	Young (AK)
Engel	Markey (MA)	

□ 1357

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 285 I was involved in a meeting off the floor of the House and reached the floor after the voting board had been closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Mr. Chet Harhut, Commissioner, Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation, Pennsylvania Department of State, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held May 18, 2010, the Honorable Mark S. Critz was elected Representative to Congress for the Twelfth Congressional District, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
BUREAU OF COMMISSIONS, ELECTIONS & LEGISLATION,
Harrisburg, PA, May 19, 2010.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. MILLER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, May 18, 2010, for Representative in Congress from the Twelfth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, show that Mark S. Critz received 70,710 or 52.6% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Mark S. Critz was elected as Representative in Congress from the Twelfth Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all counties involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

CHET HARHUT,
Commissioner.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE MARK S. CRITZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable MARK S. CRITZ, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Pennsylvania delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. CRITZ appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the 111th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE MARK S. CRITZ TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to introduce to you and to our colleagues today our newest member of the Pennsylvania delegation, MARK CRITZ. Congressman CRITZ is a dedicated public servant to the people of western Pennsylvania. For more than a decade, MARK has served in many roles for the late Jack Murtha, including as his district director. As I am sure many of you know, a Member's district director knows the ins and outs of a Member's congressional district, and MARK was an integral part of the communities for which he served and a strong advocate for them. He deeply understands the needs of western Pennsylvanians and comprehends what needs to be done to help them. MARK is a proven problem solver, and residents of western Pennsylvania can clearly see the results of his and Jack's efforts throughout their district. These experiences have prepared him well for his job as a Member of Congress.

This is a bittersweet moment for me. Jack passed away too soon. I recently said that Jack was always there when Pennsylvania needed him, and that he was emblematic of the hardworking Pennsylvanians that he represented for so many years. During many of his years in Congress working right next to him and helping Jack get the job done was MARK. I could think of no better person to take over his seat and continue Jack's efforts than MARK. It is a true honor to introduce him as the newest Congressman from Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, I yield to a Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, JOE PITTS.

□ 1400

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, the Pennsylvania Republican delegation is also proud to welcome Representative CRITZ to the House. MARK, I am sure that you will try to emulate your old boss' record of service to the people of the 12th Congressional District. He is missed by the delegation, but we're glad to have a good friend of his representing Pennsylvania in this House. I'm certain that your prior service to the 12th District will be invaluable as you serve here in Washington. On behalf of the Republican delegation, please do not hesitate to contact any of us if we can be of help as you begin your service to the people of Pennsylvania.

Again, welcome to the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRITZ. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I also would like to thank my wife, Nancy, my two beautiful children, Sadie and Joe, my entire family and Mrs. Murtha for their support. I also want to thank the people of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District, who I am honored to represent. Today I begin your work.

This moment is bittersweet for me because I wouldn't be here right now if Jack Murtha hadn't left us too soon. I have thought about the many lessons Congressman Murtha taught me. He always said to me, "It's always about the work." It is. And I'm going to work tirelessly every day in Congress for the families of western Pennsylvania. The people of western Pennsylvania, just like so many across the country, are struggling right now. The challenges we are facing are unprecedented. My priority is to put western Pennsylvanians and families across the country back to work, and I am going to fight every day, moving forward to do my part to help create good-paying American jobs. I know all of us share this commitment to getting our country back to work, and I'm optimistic that we can all come together to make this a reality on behalf of all of our constituents.

Jack Murtha spent his life working to bring jobs and opportunity to our communities. That was his fight for 36 years, and our communities are far better because of it. While nobody can fill his shoes, I now have the extraordinary honor of continuing his fight for jobs and following in his footsteps to Congress. I am honored to be here, and I pledge to my constituents that no one will work harder for them than I will. Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CRITZ), the whole number of the House is 432.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS MEN'S SWIMMING AND DIVING TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1336.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1336.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 405, noes 0, answered "present" 7, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

AYES—405

Ackerman	Campbell	Donnelly (IN)
Aderholt	Cantor	Doyle
Adler (NJ)	Cao	Dreier
Akin	Capito	Driehaus
Alexander	Capps	Duncan
Altmire	Capuano	Edwards (MD)
Andrews	Cardoza	Edwards (TX)
Arcuri	Carnahan	Ehlers
Austria	Carney	Ellison
Baca	Carson (IN)	Ellsworth
Bachmann	Carter	Emerson
Baird	Cassidy	Eshoo
Baldwin	Castle	Etheridge
Barrow	Castor (FL)	Fallin
Bartlett	Chandler	Farr
Barton (TX)	Childers	Fattah
Bean	Chu	Filner
Becerra	Clarke	Flake
Berkley	Clay	Fleming
Berman	Cleaver	Forbes
Biggert	Clyburn	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Coble	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Coffman (CO)	Fox
Bishop (NY)	Cohen	Frank (MA)
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Connolly (VA)	Fudge
Blunt	Conyers	Galleghy
Boccheri	Cooper	Garrett (NJ)
Boehner	Costa	Gerlach
Bono Mack	Costello	Giffords
Boozman	Courtney	Gingrey (GA)
Boren	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Boswell	Critz	Gonzalez
Boucher	Crowley	Goodlatte
Boustany	Cuellar	Granger
Boyd	Culberson	Graves
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Grayson
Brady (TX)	Dahlkemper	Green, Al
Braley (IA)	Davis (AL)	Green, Gene
Bright	Davis (CA)	Griffith
Broun (GA)	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Brown (SC)	Davis (KY)	Guthrie
Brown, Corrine	Davis (TN)	Gutierrez
Brown-Waite,	DeGette	Hall (NY)
Ginny	Delahunt	Hall (TX)
Buchanan	DeLauro	Halvorson
Burgess	Dent	Hare
Burton (IN)	Deutch	Harman
Butterfield	Diaz-Balart, L.	Harper
Buyer	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Calvert	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Camp	Doggett	Heinrich

Heller	McCollum	Ruppersberger
Hensarling	McCotter	Ryan (OH)
Herger	McDermott	Ryan (WI)
Hersth Sandlin	McGovern	Salazar
Higgins	McHenry	Sanchez, Loretta
Hill	McIntyre	Sarbanes
Himes	McKeon	Scalise
Hinchey	McMahon	Schakowsky
Hirono	McMorris	Schauer
Hodes	Rodgers	Schiff
Holden	McNerney	Schmidt
Holt	Meek (FL)	Schock
Honda	Meeks (NY)	Schrader
Hoyer	Melancon	Scott (GA)
Hunter	Mica	Scott (VA)
Inglis	Michaud	Sensenbrenner
Inslee	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Israel	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Issa	Miller (NC)	Sestak
Jackson (IL)	Miller, Gary	Shadegg
Jenkins	Miller, George	Shea-Porter
Johnson (GA)	Minnick	Sherman
Johnson (IL)	Mitchell	Shimkus
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan	Shuler
Johnson, Sam	Moore (KS)	Shuster
Jones	Moore (WI)	Simpson
Jordan (OH)	Moran (KS)	Sires
Kagen	Moran (VA)	Skelton
Kanjorski	Murphy (CT)	Slaughter
Kaptur	Murphy (NY)	Smith (NE)
Kennedy	Murphy, Patrick	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Murphy, Tim	Smith (TX)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Myrick	Smith (WA)
Kilroy	Nadler (NY)	Snyder
Kind	Napolitano	Space
King (IA)	Neal (MA)	Speier
King (NY)	Neugebauer	Spratt
Kingston	Nunes	Stark
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Nye	Stearns
Kissell	Obey	Stupak
Klein (FL)	Olson	Sullivan
Kline (MN)	Oliver	Sutton
Kosmas	Owens	Tanner
Kratovil	Pallone	Taylor
Kucinich	Pascrell	Teague
Lamborn	Pastor (AZ)	Terry
Lance	Paul	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Paulsen	Thompson (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Thompson (PA)
Larson (CT)	Pence	Thornberry
Latham	Perlmutter	Tiahrt
LaTourette	Perriello	Tiberi
Latta	Peters	Tierney
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Titus
Lee (NY)	Petri	Tonko
Levin	Pingree (ME)	Towns
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Tsongas
Lewis (GA)	Platts	Turner
Linder	Poe (TX)	Upton
Lipinski	Polis (CO)	Van Hollen
LoBiondo	Pomeroy	Velázquez
Loeb sack	Posey	Visclosky
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (GA)	Walden
Lowey	Price (NC)	Walz
Lucas	Putnam	Wasserman
Luetkemeyer	Quigley	Schultz
Luján	Radanovich	Waters
Lungren, Daniel	Rangel	Watson
E.	Rehberg	Watt
Lynch	Reichert	Waxman
Mack	Richardson	Weiner
Maffei	Rodriguez	Welch
Maloney	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Manzullo	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Marchant	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (OH)
Markey (CO)	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Markey (MA)	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Marshall	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
Matheson	Roskam	Woolsey
Matsui	Ross	Wu
McCarthy (CA)	Rothman (NJ)	Yarmuth
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
McCaul	Royce	Young (FL)
McClintock		

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—7

Berry	Lummis	Westmoreland
Chaffetz	Oberstar	
DeFazio	Rooney	

NOT VOTING—19

Bachus	Gordon (TN)	Reyes
Barrett (SC)	Hinojosa	Rush
Billbray	Hoekstra	Sánchez, Linda
Bonner	Jackson Lee	T.
Diaz-Balart, M.	(TX)	Schwartz
Engel	Kirk	Souder
Garamendi	Ortiz	Wamp

□ 1418

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. DEFAZIO changed his vote from “aye” to “present.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1361, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1361, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DRIEHAUS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 408, noes 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—408

Ackerman	Broun (GA)	Conyers
Aderholt	Brown (SC)	Cooper
Adler (NJ)	Brown, Corrine	Costa
Akin	Brown-Waite,	Costello
Alexander	Ginny	Courtney
Altmire	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Andrews	Burgess	Critz
Arcuri	Burton (IN)	Crowley
Austria	Butterfield	Cuellar
Baca	Buyer	Culberson
Bachmann	Calvert	Cummings
Baird	Camp	Dahlkemper
Baldwin	Campbell	Davis (AL)
Barrow	Cantor	Davis (CA)
Bartlett	Cao	Davis (IL)
Barton (TX)	Capito	Davis (KY)
Bean	Capps	Davis (TN)
Becerra	Capuano	DeFazio
Berkley	Cardoza	DeGette
Berman	Carnahan	DeLauro
Biggert	Carney	Dent
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Bishop (NY)	Carter	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bishop (UT)	Cassidy	Dicks
Blackburn	Castle	Dingell
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Blunt	Chaffetz	Donnelly (IN)
Boccieri	Chandler	Doyle
Boehner	Childers	Dreier
Bono Mack	Chu	Drieaus
Boozman	Clarke	Duncan
Boren	Clay	Edwards (MD)
Boswell	Cleaver	Edwards (TX)
Boucher	Clyburn	Ehlers
Boustany	Coble	Ellison
Boyd	Coffman (CO)	Ellsworth
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Emerson
Brady (TX)	Cole	Engel
Braley (IA)	Conaway	Eshoo
Bright	Connolly (VA)	Etheridge
Fallin		
Farr		
Fattah		
Filner		
Flake		
Fleming		
Forbes		
Fortenberry		
Foster		
Fox		
Frank (MA)		
Franks (AZ)		
Frelinghuysen		
Fudge		
Gallegly		
Garrett (NJ)		
Gerlach		
Giffords		
Gingrey (GA)		
Gohmert		
Gonzalez		
Goodlatte		
Granger		
Graves		
Grayson		
Green, Al		
Green, Gene		
Griffith		
Grijalva		
Guthrie		
Gutierrez		
Hall (NY)		
Hall (TX)		
Halvorson		
Hare		
Harman		
Harper		
Hastings (FL)		
Hastings (WA)		
Heinrich		
Heller		
Hensarling		
Herger		
Hersth Sandlin		
Higgins		
Hill		
Himes		
Hinchey		
Hirono		
Hodes		
Holden		
Holt		
Honda		
Hoyer		
Hunter		
Inglis		
Inslee		
Israel		
Issa		
Jackson (IL)		
Jenkins		
Johnson (GA)		
Johnson (IL)		
Johnson, E. B.		
Johnson, Sam		
Jones		
Jordan (OH)		
Kagen		
Kanjorski		
Kaptur		
Kennedy		
Kildee		
Kilpatrick (MI)		
Kilroy		
Kind		
King (IA)		
King (NY)		
Kingston		
Kirkpatrick (AZ)		
Kissell		
Klein (FL)		
Kline (MN)		
Kosmas		
Kratovil		
Kucinich		
Lamborn		
Lance		
Langevin		
Larsen (WA)		
Larson (CT)		
Latham		
LaTourette		
Latta		
Lee (CA)		
Lee (NY)		
Levin		
Lewis (CA)		
Lewis (GA)		
Linder		
Lipinski		
LoBiondo		
Loeb sack		
Lofgren, Zoe		
Lowey		
Lucas		
Luetkemeyer		
Luján		
Lungren, Daniel		
E.		
Lynch		
Mack		
Maffei		
Maloney		
Manzullo		
Marchant		
Markey (CO)		
Markey (MA)		
Marshall		
Matheson		
Matsui		
McCarthy (CA)		
McCarthy (NY)		
McCaul		
McClintock		
Linder		
Lipinski		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rogers (MI)		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Roskam		
Ross		
Rothman (NJ)		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Rodriguez		
Roe (TN)		
Rogers (AL)		

NOES—1

Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—22

Bachus	Garamendi	Nye
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Ortiz
Berry	Hinojosa	Reyes
Bilbray	Hoekstra	Sánchez, Linda
Bilirakis	Jackson Lee	T.
Bonner	(TX)	Schwartz
Delahunt	Kirk	Souder
Diaz-Balart, M.	Minnick	Wamp

□ 1426

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 287, had I present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 286 and 287, had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 286 and 287, if I had been present, I would have voted "yes".

GRANTING AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR FOR PURPOSES OF ITS INVESTIGATION INTO UNDERGROUND COAL MINING SAFETY

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1363 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1363

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor is granted the authority provided under clause 4(c)(3) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives in furtherance of the investigation by such committee into underground coal mine operator compliance with the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, as amended, and into other related matters.

SEC. 2. (a) The chair of the Committee on Education and Labor shall transmit to the Committee on Rules, not later than 2 days following an adjournment sine die of the second session of the 111th Congress, or January 2, 2011, whichever occurs first, a report on the activities of the Committee on Education and Labor undertaken pursuant to this resolution. Such report shall indicate—

(1) the total number of depositions taken;

(2) the number of depositions taken pursuant to subpoenas; and

(3) the name of each deponent that the committee has publicly identified by name as a deponent.

(b) Upon receipt of the report described in subsection (a) by the Committee on Rules, the chair of the Committee on Rules shall submit such report for publication in the Congressional Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides the Committee on Education and Labor with deposition authority in connection with its investigation of underground mine safety. The resolution also requires the Education and Labor Committee to report to the Rules Committee on its use of the authority by the end of this congressional session.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, we're here today with a pretty straightforward mission. We want to empower the men and women who are investigating the causes of the serious safety problems facing miners in America.

As we saw recently with the terrible disaster at Upper Big Branch Mine in Raleigh County, West Virginia, there's some combination of industrial wrongdoing there and inadequate regulation that we must address. The explosion at Upper Big Branch in April killed 29 coal miners, ripped apart an entire community and State, and was the worst mine disaster in this country since 1970.

Why is Congress involved? Because one of our most serious responsibilities as lawmakers is oversight and investigation. And from what we've been able to tell from the facts so far, there is an urgent and compelling need for the public to know all the facts surrounding this and other recent mining tragedies.

I come to this issue with a personal feeling. Many of my constituents back home and some here know that I was born in Harlan County, Kentucky, in the midst of some of the best bituminous coal on Earth. Some of my earliest memories are hearing the whistle blow at night over at the mine. Even the smallest child, as I was then, knew what that whistle meant. It meant serious trouble at the mine.

The pain and suffering endured by miners in Kentucky and West Virginia and everywhere else should inspire us to do everything in our power to make this dangerous and volatile work environment as safe as we possibly can. The bottom line should never supersede a human life.

The resolution before us today would give the House Committee on Edu-

cation and Labor staff authority to take depositions as they pursue their investigation. We know that greater review of this issue is sorely needed. There are far too many unanswered questions surrounding underground coal mine operator compliance with the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act, and the safety of every single miner in this country depends on answering those questions.

Getting to the truth on mining safety is not a partisan issue, and empowering staff to get the truth is in everyone's interest. Granting a committee this sort of authority is not without precedent. In numerous times over the years, Congress has approved resolutions such as this to provide temporary powers to committees trying to get at the truth. And every piece of information that comes from the questioning will be obtained by and shared with members of the committee from both parties.

The House gave the Education and Labor Committee similar authority during a probe into a mining accident just a few years ago. It was in the 110th Congress that the Education and Labor Committee was given staff deposition authority in their 2007–2008 investigation into the deaths of nine miners and rescue workers at the Crandall Canyon Mine near Huntington, Utah. That led to strengthening mine safety with laws that may be too lax in enforcement.

Among the issues the committee wishes to delve into is the growth of the number of mine safety enforcement cases that are pending before the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission. The Commission is meant to serve as an independent agency that provides administrative trial and appellate review to contested citations, penalties, and worker retaliation cases.

In reality, though, the increased enforcement and tougher penalties that followed several high-profile mine accidents in 2005 and 2006 has swamped the Commission. Mine owners have tripled the number of violations that they appeal, and they contest 67 percent of all penalties that are assessed. As a result, the government is facing a lengthy backlog of cases at the Commission that has surged from 2,100 in 2006 to approximately 16,000 in February of this year.

This deposition power for the committee will help to prod reluctant witnesses who have important insight into this issue but might otherwise not be willing to offer testimony. This is an important tool, and I urge my colleagues to rise and support me on this plan here today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something that is somewhat unusual. I would like to, as I did

in the Rules Committee yesterday, associate myself completely with everything that has been said by the distinguished chair of the Committee on Rules.

As I said yesterday in the Rules Committee, it's difficult to fathom the challenge that a young person would go through, as she did, hearing that whistle and knowing that there was difficulty ahead and the threat of the loss of life. And that's the reason that we are very proud to stand here, having had an exchange with Mr. MILLER—and I see Mr. RAHALL here, who obviously has suffered greatly through this; Mrs. CAPITO is here as well—to say that we would have been extraordinarily proud, Mr. Speaker, to have done this instantaneously under a unanimous consent agreement. Mr. KLINE would have agreed to that.

In our exchange with Chairman MILLER yesterday, we talked about the important rights of the minority, the fact that we are simply expanding authority that already does exist, but it is very important that we do this. That tragedy with the loss of those 29 lives is something that is—we have got to remain committed in a bipartisan way to ensure we have adequate oversight to ensure that it never, ever happens again.

We know that a hearing has taken place in the Senate today, and serious questions have come to the forefront.

And I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we were privileged to approach the majority and say that there was no reason for us to be here, no reason for us to be here, because we would have granted unanimous consent and we would not have taken this time of the House of Representatives to consider this measure.

And so the only thing that I'm in disagreement with is the fact that we are taking the time of the House to do this. And so it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I'm going to move to defeat the previous question. I'm going to move to defeat the previous question, not so that we, in any way, would undermine this very important authority that the Committee on Education and Labor is going to have, but to enhance this and get us back to an issue which I think is very near and dear to the American people since we've all agreed that this kind of authority, Democrats and Republicans alike, is essential. We believe that if we can defeat the previous question, we will have the opportunity to take on the issue of deficit spending, which has been incredibly painful all the way around.

Just today, when I last looked earlier today, the Dow Jones Industrial Average was down over 350 points. I saw it had come back a little. But we are dealing with at least a 3-month low on the Dow now.

And then we saw the numbers this morning on the dramatic increase in the jobless claims, 417,000. We are going through difficult times. We all know that. And it is essential that we do ev-

everything in our power to rein in massive Federal spending, which we believe, and I believe the American people by and large believe, has exacerbated rather than ameliorated the economic challenges that we're facing.

Americans are tired of the reckless spending, and they're outraged, Mr. Speaker, by the lack of accountability, and deeply concerned about the consequences of our fledgling economic recovery, now and for future generations as well.

After months and months of countless phone calls, emails, letters, town hall meetings, the American people are asking themselves, Why won't Washington listen? Why is our demand for fiscal responsibility not getting through? Why is the majority refusing, for the first time in modern Congressional history, to not even consider a budget?

My answer to them is that some of us, Mr. Speaker, some of us are getting the message from the American people very loudly and clearly. The Democratic majority might refuse to listen, but Republicans are serious about the issue of reining in spending. Though we've been barred by the majority from making significant reforms, we're using every tool at our disposal to force some accountability into the spending process.

One such effort is what we are calling the YouCut project, Y-O-U-C-U-T, which was launched last week on the Republican whip's Web site. Americans had the opportunity to voice their opinion on five specific spending cuts, and nearly 300,000 votes were cast, people making their thoughts known. Nearly 300,000. The proposed cuts, among those five, that drew the most votes was a welfare program that was expanded in the so-called economic stimulus bill without including any requirements that able-bodied recipients return to work. It was a concept that came forward by our friends, Messrs. PRICE and JORDAN, who've worked long and hard on this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, common sense dictates that an era of fiscal crisis is no time for creating an open-ended welfare program. Cutting this program will save taxpayers \$2.5 billion. And today, we're going to hold the Democratic majority's feet to the fire and demand a vote on this spending cut.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me say that today, when we vote on the previous question, members of both political parties will have the opportunity to state very clearly whether they are in the camp of fiscal discipline, reining in the size and scope and reach of the Federal Government, or continuing down the path of reckless spending.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue this YouCut program in the weeks ahead. Every single week Americans will have the opportunity to vote for the spending cut that they'd like to see most, and every week Republicans will demand a vote on the winning cut.

Can we eliminate the deficit in one fell swoop? Absolutely not. Everybody

knows that we can't do that. Anyone who's ever had to take responsibility for a budget knows that no magic wand will fix the problem. It takes very hard choices, one cut at a time. But with discipline and perseverance, we can restore fiscal accountability here in Washington.

The Democratic majority has made it clear that, left to their own devices, they will continue to spend our Nation into insolvency. And we've seen a projection that just came out: the notion of our national debt being 110 percent of our Nation's gross domestic product within the next 5 years, extraordinarily troubling, based on the path that we're on today.

They've put up every conceivable roadblock so far, Mr. Speaker, to accountability, but they're not going to be able to sidestep today's vote. We're ensuring that 300,000 American voices are being heard.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who cares about spending in Washington will have the opportunity to see how their Representative voted, and they'll continue to have that opportunity week after week as the YouCut program goes forward.

Now, there are a number of tactics that can be employed to prevent fiscal accountability, and the Democratic majority has tried them all. But ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the will of the American people will find a way around the roadblocks and their voices will be heard. We are determined to make sure that the voices of the American people are heard here on the floor of the people's House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that Members of this body will have the chance to take on the issue of fiscal discipline and accountability and support the Price-Jordan measure, which will finally bring us the kind of responsibility we need to our Nation's welfare program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee for yielding to me, and I certainly want to commend her for bringing this resolution to the floor and for the manner in which she has spoken from personal knowledge of the troubles and trials and tribulations, that is, that we go through in coal country, as she hails from coal country herself.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend, as well, the chairman of our Education and Labor Committee, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, within whose jurisdiction the Mine Safety Health Administration resides. Mr. MILLER is certainly a true champion of our coal miners and one who has coal mine health and safety deep in his bones. He will be traveling to our district in southern West Virginia on Monday to have a hearing to

listen to family members or those who lost loved ones at UBB in that horrific tragedy on April 5.

□ 1445

I also wish to commend the House of Representatives in a bipartisan fashion for the very swift action in which the House passed a resolution after this tragedy commending those 29 fallen miners and expressing condolences to their families. We continue to work with the family members to help them through what is a difficult process known as healing and trying to get by in life now without their loved ones.

This resolution is to grant the Committee on Education and Labor deposition authority as part of the committee's oversight activities relating to coal mine health and safety. While I am not a member of the Education and Labor Committee, the disaster which took place on April 5 at the Upper Big Branch mine in Raleigh County, West Virginia, claiming the lives of 29 men, occurred in the congressional district of which I am honored to represent.

This resolution reflects the seriousness with which the House of Representatives takes the issue of coal mine health and safety, the loss of these 29 brave souls, and the grief of their families and friends.

The UBB mine disaster was the worst in our Nation, as the gentlelady from New York, the chair of the Rules Committee, has stated, the worst disaster in our coal mines in our Nation since 1970.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RAHALL. It follows in the wake of the Sago mine disaster in 2006, which claimed 12 lives; the Darby mine disaster was also in 2006, which claimed 12 lives; and Crandall Canyon mine disaster in 2007, which claimed nine lives. While Congress responded in 2006, again under the very capable leadership of the Education and Labor Committee chairman, Mr. MILLER, with the enactment of what is referred to as the MINER Act, the focus then was on emergency response.

In the wake of the UBB disaster, it is now entirely appropriate that we investigate coal mine health and safety matters further. And the committee on Education and Labor is the appropriate forum for that to take place.

I again commend Chairman GEORGE MILLER and his ranking member, Mr. JOHN KLINE, for pursuing a responsible course in the conduct of this, their oversight responsibilities. I do urge the adoption of the resolution. And I would note and thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER, as well for the bipartisan support that he and members of the Rules Committee and on the minority side are giving this particular resolution, although they are trying to of course hijack it for other purposes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my friend for his very

thoughtful remarks and say again how horribly we all feel about the tragedy that he and Mrs. CAPITO and others from his State have suffered. And once again, we totally agree with exactly what it is we are attempting to do here.

With that, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to our distinguished Republican whip, who has launched the YouCut item on his Web site, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from California.

I would just like to follow up on the remarks that we, too, would tell the gentleman from West Virginia, we agree entirely with the thrust of his remarks and express our sorrow for the folks of West Virginia who have experienced such a tragic loss.

I would say again, the ranking member on the Rules Committee has indicated already that we could have already embarked upon the effort that the gentleman from West Virginia and the lady from New York speak about because we did offer unanimous consent on this. So we are in total agreement there. However, I will rise in opposition to the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, for the millions of Americans demanding accountability for the culture of reckless runaway spending in Washington, meet YouCut. At a time when approval of congressional spending has reached its lowest ebb, this first-of-its-kind initiative empowers taxpayers with the ability to contribute directly to a new culture of savings in our Nation's capital.

Each week the public votes on one of five wasteful spending items that they would like to strip from the Federal budget. Once the votes are tallied, the House will vote on whether or not to cut the winning provision from the Federal balance sheet.

Within 5 days of the experiment, over 280,000 Americans cast their vote either online or by text message. That's a rate, Mr. Speaker, of more than 2,000 votes per hour, with less than 1 percent of the votes originating from inside the Beltway, I might add. The overwhelming response speaks to the extreme frustration taxpayers feel toward a Congress that refuses to listen to them.

Make no mistake: America is at a critical crossroads. The American people are tired of the spending binges. They look across the Atlantic and see Europe collapsing under the weight of its debt. With our own deficit swelling, it's only natural to fear that we are heading down the same road to ruin.

YouCut is not a political venture. It is about shifting the pendulum in Washington back towards the direction of saving money. Rooting out unnecessary spending should be a bipartisan endeavor. This week the House has considered two bills to name a post office and a Federal building, 11 resolutions honoring different individuals, sports teams, or causes, including even recognizing Craft Beer Week. We have considered bills to spend more money and create new programs.

Mr. Speaker, what we have not considered is a single bill to reduce spending. Unfortunately, this is a pretty typical week. Today we have a chance to change that. During the first week of YouCut, a plurality of voters chose to axe a recently created \$2.5 billion annual welfare program that undercuts cost-saving welfare reforms made in 1996 by a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. It was bipartisan reform. This new program undermines those reforms.

While it was just created last year, the reports of waste and fraud are already trickling in: perverse incentives for States to increase welfare caseloads, reports of cash being given out to welfare recipients that is then used to buy flat-screen TVs, iPods, and video gaming systems. Enough is enough.

To put it simply, even when the funds are not being so extravagantly wasted, we cannot afford this program. The American people understand this. That is why they asked us to vote on this proposal to terminate this program and to use that money to reduce the deficit. This previous question vote is the vote to do just that.

Today, over a quarter-million Americans will get to see whether their Representatives in Congress share their specific fiscal priorities. I urge my colleagues to listen to the voice of the people and take up this vote today and vote "no" on the previous question.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and a champion of all working people, Mr. MILLER.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chair of the Rules Committee for bringing this rule to the floor of the House and to thank the ranking member, Mr. DREIER, from California for his cooperation and support for this resolution. I, too, associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), who probably has more experience and understanding of these tragedies than any Member who doesn't live in the coal regions of our country, and has spent a lot of time with myself and others on our committee discussing these issues of coal mine safety, tragically throughout the years as we have had one accident after another over that time.

The resolution that the Rules Committee brings to the House floor today reflects the seriousness with which Congress takes the issue of mine safety. Last month we watched the tragic events unfold in the Upper Big Branch mine in West Virginia. The memory of the 29 miners who lost their lives in that disaster must stand as a reminder of the work that remains to be done to keep our Nation's miners safe.

There is much to be learned about the disaster at the Upper Big Branch mine. I have been heartened by the swift and decisive action taken so far

by the Department of Labor and the Mine Safety and Health Administration. I expect their investigations into this particular tragedy will be comprehensive. The resolution we are discussing today, however, will be in furtherance of our committee's broader oversight duties regarding the health and the safety of our Nation's coal miners.

Last year, our committee staff began looking into issues relating to the backlog of cases at the Federal Mine Safety Review Commission. This commission and its administrative law judges hear mine operators' contests of the citations Mine Safety and Health Administration inspectors issue against the operators. This backlog has potentially severe ramifications for miners' safety.

The backlog has prevented MSHA from placing mines on what is called a pattern of violations because so many of those mine citations remain bound up in the litigation. Because of this increased scrutiny it would bring, mines warned by MSHA that they are about to be designated as having a potential pattern of violations generally significantly improve their mine safety record. But the mine owners have figured out a way to game that system, and therefore, the miners and their families are robbed of this very powerful tool that would ensure greater safety of their workplace and perhaps avoid some of the tragedies that we have just witnessed.

In February, our committee explored a recent uptick in the citation contests and how it might ultimately affect safety in the mines. In the wake of the Upper Big Branch mine disaster and our hearings on mine operator citation appeals and backlogs, I am deeply concerned about what coal mining conglomerates have done to encourage or discourage safe mining practices. That is why I believe that our committee's oversight responsibility would benefit from the authority to hold and compel witnesses' attendance at depositions.

Deposition authority is a powerful tool for many investigations, but some investigations would particularly benefit from the tool. Last Congress, Congress granted the committee deposition authority in our investigation of the Crandall Canyon mine disaster in Utah. This successful investigation led to a criminal referral to the Department of Justice, in large part because of the evidence that our staff obtained in those depositions. I understand that the Department of Justice continues to investigate our referral.

I believe that the deposition authority is equally justified in this case. A deposition can serve as an intermediate step between a full public hearing, an executive session, and informal staff interviews. It creates a formal record; yet it allows us to explore issues in a more sustained manner than would be practical at a hearing. Indeed, it allows us to realize that the potential witness does not have the knowledge of par-

ticular issues to justify calling them at a hearing.

It was because of the usefulness of this investigative tool that our committee this Congress approved the committee rules package to include deposition procedural rules. We wanted to build on our successes and our execution of the deposition authority granted last Congress, and we wanted to be ready should the circumstances justify seeking the authority again. Unfortunately, the tragic deaths at Upper Big Branch have again highlighted the importance of our investigative work on mine safety and that our committee again investigate the issues related to mine safety.

The committee's deposition rule respects and affirms the rights of those individuals being deposed and respects the rights of the minority on our committee. It has been worked out with the minority on our committee. It is the result of a bipartisan process began last Congress and reaffirmed with the adoption of our committee rules this Congress. We have used the tool sparingly and effectively in the past, and I assure the committee that we will use it sparingly and effectively in this investigation.

Next week, my committee will be conducting a field hearing in West Virginia with Congressman RAHALL. We will be hearing from the families of the victims of the Upper Big Branch mine explosion. Just as we made sure to hear from the families of Sago and the Crandall Canyon, we will hear the concerns of these families. With every such hearing we pledge to the families to never turn a deaf ear to their concerns, their knowledge, to make sure that mining is safer. I intend to keep that pledge, and the resolution before us is part of keeping that pledge.

Again, I want to thank the ranking Republican on our committee, Congressman KLINE, and his staff who worked closely and effectively with me and my staff in framing the deposition rules and in framing our future investigations and going before the Rules Committee to ask for this authority from the Rules Committee.

Again, I want to thank the chair and the ranking member for bringing this matter to the floor and thank Congressman RAHALL for his support for our committee having this authority.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for his thoughtful remarks.

At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Charleston, West Virginia, who clearly has suffered greatly through this extraordinary tragedy, Mrs. CAPITO.

Mrs. CAPITO. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time.

I understand that there is no controversy really on this underlying resolution. I wish we could have done this, and I think we could have done it several days earlier to get started on this under unanimous consent. So I wish

that was the direction that we had gone.

But as we have said, on April 5, 2010, an explosion occurred at the Upper Big Branch mine in West Virginia, killing 29 miners. And our hearts and prayers still are with the families and with the communities who have suffered greatly. This disaster was the worst mine disaster in West Virginia and the third mining disaster over the last 4 years. In 2006 in my district, 13 coal miners were trapped for nearly 2 hours at the Sago mine, and one miner miraculously survived.

I agree, my colleagues, that Congress has a very important oversight role to ensure that the laws are properly executed and to prevent future mining accidents. There must be a thorough investigation by Congress to determine whether the executive branch agencies charged with protecting miners are performing their job and whether changes need to be made to ensure that those agencies fulfill their obligations to the miners, their families, and the public.

□ 1500

Also, the Congress needs to have a thorough investigation into the company practices and whether safety is the top priority and the one priority first considered whenever beginning or starting to pursue coal mining and while it's in operation. Congress, however, must be wary not to compromise the integrity of any future or pending investigations and potentially jeopardize the executive branch's ability to enforce and hold violators accountable.

Keeping our miners safe requires all of us to work together to prevent mine disasters from happening in the first place. I support this rule, and I vow to take whatever measures are necessary to ensure the safety and health of all miners.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, the Chair of the Workforce Protection Committee, Ms. WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for allowing me this time, and I appreciate the cooperation we're getting from both sides of the aisle on this very important issue.

On April 5, 29 miners were killed and two injured in a massive explosion which ripped through Massey Energy's Upper Big Branch mine in Montcoal, West Virginia. It was a shock to all of us. Unfortunately since then, there have been two other mine accidents, one in Kentucky and another in West Virginia, that have resulted in even more fatalities.

The explosion at the Upper Big Branch mine was the worst mine accident since 1970 when 38 miners were killed in an explosion at a mine in Kentucky.

We are now, Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century, and there is absolutely no excuse for these tragedies. There are ongoing investigations into the explosion

at the Upper Big Branch mine so we don't yet know exactly what caused this blast, but we do know that Massey Energy has a long, long history of health and safety violations at this mine and others of theirs and that it has received hundreds—not a few—but hundreds of citations before the blast occurred.

This tragedy and the conduct of this mine owner towards the safety of its workers further highlight the need for the Education and Labor Committee to fully perform oversight functions. We owe this much to the families of the fallen miners and to those miners who go to work each and every day so that they can come home safely to their families every night.

The deposition authority provided by this resolution, which is the product of a bipartisan agreement, as we all know, is a vital tool for the committee, and I urge passage of this resolution by every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the coauthor of the very important issue that's going to bring back accountability to welfare, the gentleman from Roswell, Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

We all are strongly sympathetic and unanimously support the underlying resolution, and our thoughts and prayers go out to the victims and the families of all mine disasters.

We should take this as an opportunity, however, Mr. Speaker, to unanimously decrease spending. Everybody across this land knows that Washington spends too much and it borrows too much and it taxes too much. Washington has grown fat on bloated, wasteful spending for far too long. It's collapsing our fiscal house; it's jeopardizing our kids' and our grandkids' future; and it is undermining our economy. And it's high time that we put the Federal Government on a diet, and that can begin today.

With the YouCut program, Republicans are partnering with the American people to restore fiscal sanity. This is a unique initiative where we are asking the American people to help prioritize which special-interest handouts and other wasteful spending they want to target for elimination. This YouCut initiative combines two crucial components of commonsense governing: listening to the people and cutting waste from government spending.

So I'm grateful for the huge participation that we have already seen, over 281,000 votes cast, of which less than 1 percent are from the District of Columbia. So Americans all across this land are participating.

The spending reduction that Representative JORDAN and I proposed received more than 81,000 votes. We identified, and America supported the repeal, of a \$2.5 billion-per-year program that has gutted the positive bipartisan welfare reforms of the 1990s.

As part of their failed stimulus package, Democrats added a new program to incentivize States to increase, yes increase, Mr. Speaker, their welfare caseloads without requiring work from those able to work or get job training or make other efforts to move off taxpayer assistance. Welfare reform was one of the most important bipartisan achievements of the last two decades, and it's been terribly undermined by this little-noticed provision.

So rather than take our Nation backwards, we need to vote today to restore welfare reform by refocusing temporary assistance on people getting back on their feet as quickly as possible. So I hope that our Democrat colleagues will follow our lead and, yes, the lead of the American people in working together to put Washington's fiscal house back in order.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to partner with our Democrat colleagues to rein in wasteful spending; but their help in this matter has not, frankly, been forthcoming. In fact, they have chosen to explode the annual deficits to over a trillion dollars and add costly new government mandates and tax hikes that stand in the way of job creation.

So let's start today, together, to begin the job of getting our Nation back on track. Vote "no" on the previous question. Vote for fiscal responsibility.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady, the chair of the Rules Committee.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1363, which gives the Committee on Education and Labor, on which I sit, the ability to investigate the Upper Big Branch mine disaster. This resolution allows us to do our work, and I would like to speak about that subject.

In a greater sense, this resolution honors the coal miners who perished in the tragedy and works to ensure that such a tragedy never happens again. We owe it to the remaining families and to all mining families.

I feel strongly and personally about the concerns of miners because I was born and reared in West Virginia where my father, the late U.S. Senator many decades ago, was known as one of the best friends the miner has ever had.

There's no question that mining has been a dangerous job. Although the number of deaths in America's mines has been reduced, today coal mining is rated still among the most dangerous jobs in America, and it does not have to be that way.

I support the Education and Labor Committee's work to investigate any possible health and safety violations at Upper Big Branch and to see if laws were circumvented and miners' lives were put recklessly at risk. Those responsible must be held accountable.

Too many families have suffered the loss of a loved one in a mining disaster.

We in Congress need to investigate fully the factors that led to these tragedies. We need to investigate fully the deficiencies in laws, regulations, and enforcement that may have contributed. We owe it to the families of the miners lost and the miners who work every day to take action.

We must prevent these accidents from happening again, and I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1363.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a hardworking member of the House Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Duluth, Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my sincere sorrow to the families of those who were killed or wounded in that accident and all mine accidents and remind our friends that this could have been done on unanimous consent without a rule, but since the rule is here, I rise in support of defeating the previous question to the rule so that we can consider Mr. PRICE's motion.

The 1996 Republican welfare reform successfully reduced welfare dependence and poverty and increased work and earnings. But despite that success, opponents have spent years trying to undermine welfare reform. They saw a new opening in the Democrats' 2009 stimulus law. In that trillion-dollar bill, they created a new \$5 billion welfare emergency fund designed to promote welfare dependence all over again.

The new fund pays States if they increase welfare caseloads, among other outcomes. States have been less than eager to collect. By mid-May, less than half, \$2.4 billion, had actually been claimed by States. Only three States received full shares. You know something is wrong when the Federal Government has trouble giving away money.

Mr. PRICE's motion would end this program right here and right now. And that is the right policy for a program that should never have been begun. Just consider how this emergency money has been spent so far. One of the largest chunks has been spent on something called "non-recurrent short-term assistance." A program operated in New York last summer offers an example: New York used these funds to make one-time \$200 payments to welfare and food stamp recipients supposedly for back-to-school purchases. But that's not how the money was really used. Some recipients used the money, as CBS News put it, to buy "flat screen TVs, iPods, and video gaming systems." Convenience stores in low-income areas noted marked "increases in beer, lotto, and cigarette sales."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DREIER. I yield my friend an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LINDER. ATMs ran out of cash, so now we have no idea how those funds

were spent, but I suspect many can guess.

The Subcommittee on Welfare, on which I serve, recently had a hearing on this fund. One witness noted taxpayers already spend an incredible \$953 billion per year on welfare and other low-income benefits. I asked the administration witness sent to us is she still asking for more welfare spending. I said, Is it your testimony that \$953 billion is not enough? Her answer was telling: Who's to say what is enough?

It is time that the American people are saying this is enough and so should we.

[From the Political Hotsheet, Sept. 2, 2009]

UNPLUGGED EXCLUSIVE: STIMULUS FUNDS FOR SCHOOL SUPPLIES MISUSED

(By Sharyl Attkisson)

Getting kids back to school with the clothes and supplies they need can strain the family budget. That's why the Governor of New York decided to use federal stimulus funds for a back-to school program. Needy families got a one-time payment of \$200 dollars per child to buy school supplies. It adds up to \$140 million of your tax dollars.

Neasey Hendricks, single mother of five, says she's putting the money to good use.

"Definitely sneakers, try to save a little bit for a haircut, a couple of pairs of pants, some shirts, get the girls a few skirts," Hendricks says.

While few argued with the concept of helping low-income families, nobody anticipated the chaos that would come next.

On August 11th, the state of New York deposited the \$140 million in stimulus money into the individual food stamp and welfare accounts of people on public assistance. Some saw their balance shoot up by a thousand dollars all at once. The idea was they would use their regular welfare benefits card, which acts like a debit card, to buy the school supplies. There was just one problem. The letter from the state telling them what the money was for didn't arrive until days later. By then, it was too late.

"No one questions the intention of this particular program. However there is an extraordinary distance between the good intention of the program and the implementation of the program," Monroe County's Commissioner of Health Services Kelly Reed said on Wednesday's edition of "Washington Unplugged," which first reported the story.

County Executive Maggie Brooks says social workers were flooded with calls from merchants who were afraid fraud was being committed.

"We had different retailers calling us and saying people were coming in with their benefit transaction card, and they are purchasing flat screen TV's, iPods and video gaming systems," Brooks told CBS News. Brooks doesn't blame the recipients—she blames the state for not ensuring the funds were spent for school.

Businessman Josh Babin says the day stimulus money went into the welfare accounts, business at his Rochester Cell phone store doubled. And he doesn't sell school supplies. "Most of them came in, picked up most of their accessories, most of their products."

Welfare recipients were also free to withdraw the money as cash. That led to an unexpected run on ATM's across the state. Brenda Smith, manager of a Wilson Farms store in Monroe County, said most of her increase in sales when the stimulus funds were disbursed were not in school supplies, but in "pre-pay cell or credit cards." She said her store's ATM was wiped empty.

Managers of three Wilson Farms convenience stores in Rochester also reported

empty ATM machines and increases in beer, lotto and cigarette sales.

Managers of four Tops Markets stores in Rochester had similar stories. On West Avenue, the store's three ATM's were all depleted by noon on August 11th. "Large increase in volume of customers but minimal spoke in sales which were not in school supplies but rather candy racks at the register," stated investigative notes obtained by CBS News. So many welfare customers were seeking cash back; the stores implemented a \$50.00 cash back limit on-the-spot. At the East Ridge Road location, the ATM ran out of money on August 11 as well. "Numerous clients came in and purchase minimal items to withdraw the \$50.00 limit and then returned to other cashiers in the store in order to retrieve all the money out of their account," reads investigative notes. And on Upper Falls Blvd., the Tops Market reported "500 more customers" but "\$4,000 less in sales" than usual. Also, ATM's containing \$60,000 were entirely depleted.

On "Unplugged" Reed said one recipient "had \$1000 dollars on their card and jumped over a period of a few minutes over eighteen lines in a Tops store buying something for forty nine cents for two dollars for fifty cents and getting fifty dollars back in cash," each time.

ATM's were also wiped out in hours at many Wegman's stores statewide and the owner of a Sunoco station described "scenes of panic" at her store, with public assistance customers flooding her ATM machine. Some of them, she says, immediately used the cash to buy cigarettes and beer.

Monroe County investigators sampled the accounts of more than 70 drug and alcohol rehabilitation clients and found more than half of them withdrew their back-to-stimulus funds entirely in cash.

New York Congressman Eric Massa (D-NY) supports the stimulus bill, but said this program is flawed. "It's a matter of accountability," Massa said. "Ensuring what's happening with the funding. You and I both know where there's crevices, the water will go through those crevices."

New York State officials defend the stimulus program saying no matter what welfare recipients purchased with the taxpayer funds, it served to stimulate the economy. State spokesman for the program, Kristen Proud said it stimulated the economy. Supporters accuse critics of making unfair stereotypes about welfare recipients. "We have as many examples of families using the dollars for school clothes, school uniforms, school supplies," Proud said when asked about reports of luxury items being purchased with the back-to-school stimulus funds.

In Rochester, the Rev. Marlowe V.N. Washington, Pastor of the Baber African Methodist Episcopal Church, contacted CBS News to say that hundreds of grateful local residents have been helped by the back-to-school funds, and that it's unfair for anyone to assume they didn't spend the money on school supplies. "That is offensive, attacking and mean spirited," Washington told us. "People need to hear how stimulus funds have benefited American families and not hurt them."

We asked the Inspector General on stimulus funds for comment on this stimulus project. Based on our report, I.G. spokesman Edward Pound told CBS News that his office has notified the HHS Inspector General to make sure that agency is aware of the problem. HHS is the department from which the back-to-school stimulus funds to New York State originated.

Because debit cards don't list what was bought, state officials say they'll never know how much of the \$140 million actually went for school supplies. Those who bought luxury

items didn't break any laws, because there were no strings attached to the money. Little consolation to taxpayers who were promised that they'd know how every dime of stimulus funds was spent.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the coauthor of the amendment who's joined Mr. PRICE in bringing about welfare accountability, the gentleman from Urbana, Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the people have spoken. They said stop the ridiculous spending, and with the YouCut proposal, they have said stop the ridiculous spending which incentivizes the wrong behavior and insults basic American values. Think about the old welfare system. Think about what it said in particular to the single mother out there. It said, Don't get a job, don't get married, have more children, and we will pay you more money. That's exactly the wrong kind of incentives you want to send in government policies, but that's exactly where the Democrats' proposal takes us back to.

Our amendment would change that. Our previous question would change that.

Democrats want to move back in the wrong direction. We think that it's completely the wrong way to go, particularly at a time, particularly at a time when we have a \$1.4 trillion deficit, a \$12 trillion national debt. It is the wrong thing to do.

You know, one of the things that makes our country so special, one of the things that makes America the greatest Nation in history is this simple little concept: parents make sacrifices for their children so that when they grow up, they have life better than we did. And when they, in turn, become adults and become parents, they'll do the same things for their kids. Each generation in this country has done that for the next.

Now we find ourselves with the policymakers, where the political class is making decisions that say spend now, focus on the moment, and send the bill to somebody else. And it is wrong. It is wrong to trap people in this welfare system. It is wrong to keep spending and spending. It is wrong for future generations of Americans, and that's why, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

□ 1515

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Let's talk about jobs.

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle have completely forgotten what the subject of today's presentation is, and that's about mine safety, about protecting the people who are going deep underground to help fuel this country. They have completely

forgotten about that. That's not of any interest to them, obviously, because they want to talk about other things. What they want to come in here and talk about is completely off topic. They would like America to continue to be afraid, to continue to be in doom and gloom. That's their whole argument.

What is happening here—and they would like everybody to forget about it. Their prescription for this country is mass amnesia. They want to forget about the fact that under George Bush this country was dropping into the abyss in terms of jobs.

The last month of George Bush, this country lost 780,000 jobs in that month alone. Last month, in April, 14 months later, we gained 290,000 jobs. That is a swing of over 1 million jobs a month. In 1 month, a million-job swing. But, no, they don't want to talk about that. They want to talk about, Hey, we've got too many problems. We don't want to put the 8 million people who lost their jobs back to work. We don't want to take care of them. Okay?

Well, as this country gets back on its feet, its economy starts booming, it takes care of a lot of what they are talking about in terms of debt and deficit. But once we are back on our feet, then we can look at these numbers that they are talking about. But we have got to get this country back on its feet. It has got to be strong.

So we should be here dealing with a serious subject like mine safety and all those men and women that were killed a couple months ago. That's a serious discussion, and we are not even having that discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. So let's talk about what actually happened.

Under George Bush, this economy fell off the planet, dropped 6.4 percent the last quarter of 2008. We haven't seen anything like that since 1929. During the last 9 months, all of a sudden our GDP is going up so that this country is getting back on its feet and heading in the right direction.

Job loss, as I said, was at a level unseen before. We are reversing that, but we have got a long way to go. And today, we should be worried about mine safety and getting this bill passed.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that, with all due respect to my very good friend and Rules Committee colleague, that he obviously has not followed the debate.

We approached the majority and said, under unanimous consent, we wanted this kind of authority to be granted so that we could ensure that never, ever again will we see the kind of tragic loss of life because of a mine disaster that we have faced.

Now, my friend said that we were talking about some extraneous issue.

Then, he takes the well and begins talking about jobs under George Bush, where, in fact, we are dealing with the issue that we have all said needs to be addressed, and that is, from the very outset, Mr. Speaker, we concurred with the desire to ensure that this authority exists.

At this point, I yield 1 minute to my very, very good friend from Michigan, a hardworking, very, very thoughtful Member, Mrs. MILLER.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And, Mr. Speaker, all Americans, all Americans, share the grief of the families of the miners of West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, spending by this Congress is out of control. In the next few days, our national debt will surpass \$13 trillion, and today the Federal Government borrows about 40 cents of every dollar that it spends. The American people have been speaking out, saying that this out-of-control spending is not sustainable. They are very frustrated that Washington and the Democrat majority is not listening.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republicans are listening. We have heard their voices.

YouCut allows the American people to vote on specific spending cuts. We actually had over 300,000 folks just vote this week. The goal of YouCut is simple, and it should not be a novel concept on Capitol Hill: Stop spending and start cutting. The question, again, is, Will Washington listen? Can you hear them now?

A "no" vote on the previous question will allow us to debate this spending cut put forward by the American people. Is that too much to ask?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Because he didn't really get the chance to finish, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. PERLMUTTER from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I would like to speak to my friend from Michigan, and she probably knows as much as anybody the trauma that so many families have felt by the economy, by the recession, by the layoffs. And as we start moving forward, we have got to make sure that those people who lost their jobs find employment.

Now, they say Washington is not listening about cuts. We know spending needs to be managed, but we need to be smart in how we spend. But I would say to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, they should have been thinking about this back in 2001 when they cut the taxes for the wealthiest of Americans, prosecute two wars without paying for them, fail to police Wall Street, and leave this country in the worst financial shape it has been since 1929. George Bush left; Obama received a \$1.3 trillion deficit.

Now, they want to complain about it. Okay, go ahead and complain about it, but take a look at yourselves. That's what I would say to my friends on the other side of the aisle. And I would say, on Tuesday, they made all of these arguments. The one race that was up be-

tween Democrats and Republicans, people were worried about jobs. The Democrat won. They worried about jobs. And that's what this country needs is to get people back to work.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1 minute to my good friend from Dallas, Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mine safety is a very serious issue. So is national bankruptcy.

Under Democratic control, the deficit has exploded tenfold in just 2 years. We are seeing the national debt triple before our very eyes. We are borrowing 40 cents on the dollar from the Chinese and sending the bill to our children and our grandchildren.

The Democrats have been on a spending spree that puts us on the road to becoming Greece. House Republicans are fighting back with a new program called YouCut, where the American people can participate in voting themselves to cut spending and to save their children money. And in just this week alone, 280,000 voted to cut a wasteful welfare program that has been associated with fraud.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is simple: Either you cut or your children and grandchildren go bankrupt paying the national debt.

Vote "no" on the previous question and vote "yes" for fiscal sanity. Vote "yes" for saving your children and grandchildren \$2.5 billion that doesn't have to be borrowed from the Chinese.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the chairlady for yielding.

I think it is important for the House to reflect on what we are and are not doing.

What we are doing is considering a procedure by which the Congress can investigate what may or may not have happened in the tragedy that occurred in West Virginia that cost the miners their lives, setting that process in motion.

What the minority is doing is trying to bring to the floor a vote on a different matter regarding the TANF program. And that is well within their rights, so I am not going to object to their procedural efforts to do that. I am going to object to the substance of their argument.

If I understand it correctly, the cut that they are interested in making is in a program that I think most Americans think makes pretty good sense. And what it essentially says is, if you are able-bodied and you receive welfare benefits, you should work. Most Americans, when they hear that, would say it is a pretty good idea.

And I want to read to the minority that this program that they want to

debate today was commented on by a gentleman from a think tank in Washington who said: Given the state of the labor market, it is hard to imagine how any sensible person could oppose extending the emergency fund that they are talking about.

This was not from the Obama administration or one of the more liberal groups in town. It was Kevin Hassett of the American Enterprise Institute.

So I would say to the minority that their thirst for spending cuts was somehow missing when the Bush administration raised spending by 8 percent per year, when the Bush administration launched two wars on borrowed money, when the Bush administration cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans and paid for it by borrowing money from the Chinese.

There is a record on spending increases in recent history. During the Clinton years, Federal spending increased by 4 percent per year on the average. During the Bush years, spending increased by 8 percent per year on the average. In the first 2 years of the President's term, spending has increased by 6 percent, given the economic emergency. But during the 8 years of President Reagan's term, spending increased by 7 percent per year.

So I am with the minority, Mr. Speaker. I think spending restraint is something we need to have, which is why we should make sure we never have another Republican majority in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. DREIER. I will just say to my friend that the closing was very, very inappropriate, because the solution that the gentleman has offered to the 8 percent increase that existed during the Bush administration is to have an 85 percent increase in nondefense discretionary spending, which is what has taken place in the last 2 years. And I thank my friend for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another 45 seconds.

Mr. ANDREWS. I would ask my friend from California if it is true or false that spending increases in the Obama years have been 6 percent and 8 during the Bush years. Is that true or false?

Mr. DREIER. And I will say that it is absolutely false. What has happened is, we did see the 8 percent increase for defense, homeland security, and veteran spending, which did increase during that period of time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time. If I understand it correctly, the gentleman is denying that the spending increases averaged 8 percent during the Bush years. Is that correct?

Mr. DREIER. Correct. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, then you are agreeing with me. You are not denying it.

Mr. DREIER. I agree with the gentleman that they increased 8 percent during the Bush administration, but they have increased 85 percent in nondefense discretionary spending in the Obama administration.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reclaiming my time, the best insurance policy against spending increases is a Democratic majority.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say to my friend that we have had an 85 percent increase in nondefense discretionary spending since President Obama has been in office.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

□ 1530

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. How much of that 85 percent was the Recovery Act?

Mr. DREIER. Eighty-five percent increase in nondefense discretionary spending. If we look at the 417,000 increase in the jobless and if we look at the markets now, we can see it's failed.

With that, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Wheaton, Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I found the gentleman from New Jersey's logic dizzying. It took 43 American Presidents, from George Washington to George W. Bush, for us to accumulate \$5 trillion in debt. This Congress and this administration unambiguously are tripling that number in a decade. I also found it sobering and kind of surprising that the gentleman from Colorado a couple of minutes ago—and I wrote it down immediately—said, Once we're back on our feet, then we can talk about it, or words to that effect. Once we're back on our feet, then we can talk about cutting spending? It is this bloated budget that is the restraining influence on prosperity in this country. It is the hidebound orthodoxy on the other side that says we can borrow and spend our way into prosperity—and that is an economic fool's errand. It is the sinkhole of self-absorption of this Congress and this generation that says we want to spend, spend, spend, and pass the bill on to another generation. We need to defeat this previous question so we can get serious about these cuts.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know the time remaining, please.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I will join the distinguished Chair in asking how much time is remaining on each side, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 4¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 4¾ time remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the chairwoman of our Rules Committee.

I think what is key here is this country needs to get back on its feet. We're moving in that direction. We had a bill up this week called the America COMPETES Act, which is about investing in this country's future through grants and funding of our National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, those kinds of investments which are jobs today and investment in the future so that this country is on the best footing to compete with every other country on the globe. My friends on the other side have now twice undercut that whole operation, that whole bill. But this Congress is going to keep this country moving forward so that we have jobs today and we invest in the future so that we don't have the kind of job loss that we saw at the end of the Bush administration.

People in this country, as much as my friends would like it to be doom and gloom and blame, what they want is a can-do approach, because the spirit of America is that we can do this. We can make this better. We will make this better. We're not taking "no" for an answer. Failure is not an option. We are going to invest in this country today, help people get back to work, and we will be a stronger Nation for it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to my good friend from Lubbock, Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, in a minute, we're going to have a vote on the previous question. It's going to be a very simple vote. If you vote "yes"—and I think a lot of my colleagues on the other side are going to do that—that means yes, keep on spending money we don't have. Now I'm going to vote "no" because I believe that the American people are speaking out—and I'm listening—that they're tired of spending.

There's a picture in the cloakroom of a little girl standing next to a dollhouse. She says, You know, I owe \$41,966, and all I own is a dollhouse. Really, that's what this is about. This is about the future of our children and our grandchildren. And what we're doing every day is mortgaging that future. Today, we have almost \$13 trillion in debt. We're on course here to double that debt in 5 years and triple it in 10 years.

What are we going to say to our children and our grandchildren when we leave them with a legacy that, basically, all they get to do is service the debt service? We've got to stop it. And so that's the reason the right vote on the previous question is "yes" if you want to keep on spending. But if you want to stop spending, you want to bring fiscal responsibility to this country, you want to leave a legacy of opportunity and empowerment for our future generations, you're going to vote "no." It's time to listen to the 280,000 people that participated in YouCut last week that said, Stop the spending. Vote "no" on the previous question.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. May

I request from my colleague if he is ready to close?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 2¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me close as I began, saying first that we could have done this under unanimous consent. We all concur with the need to ensure that we take steps to ensure adequate oversight to ensure that we never, ever, ever see the kind of loss of life that we did in West Virginia or any other mine disaster.

Mr. Speaker, the American people, the hundreds of millions of Americans who want us to rein in Federal spending have, unfortunately, because of the Democratic majority, they have been denied a voice here on the House floor. They're saying, Try and bring down the size and scope and reach of government.

My friend, Dennis Prager, says, very correctly, the bigger the government grows, the smaller the individual becomes. And so we decided to utilize a procedure here known as defeating the previous question. And we said, Why don't we let the American people actually have a chance to be heard? And so what we did is we put five proposals out there on the Republican Whip's Web site and asked the American people to vote. Nearly 300,000 Americans cast votes, and they ended up with 81,000 votes being cast in favor of a measure that said, Gosh, should people be required to work for welfare or should we have an open-ended policy that allows them, without any kind of accountability, to see States actually rewarded for not having people have a work component in the welfare program?

So, Mr. Speaker, we said with that overwhelming vote that we would use this procedure to ensure that Democrats and Republicans alike would have an opportunity to make a decision whether or not they want to go down the road towards continued spending where, again, we've had an 85 percent increase in nondefense discretionary spending since President Obama has been in office. And that's why I couldn't understand why my friend from New Jersey was arguing that we had an 8 percent increase when President Bush was there, and his answer is a tenfold increase and that's going to solve the problem.

We know that we are deeper in the hole. We have more serious problems now, and the American people want us to cut Federal spending, and every Democrat and Republican will have a chance when we move to defeat the previous question to do just that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous material be included in the RECORD just before the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that, I urge my colleagues to vote for reduced spending by defeating the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this has been a most interesting debate. As I started, I am terribly concerned about what caused the awful mine disaster in West Virginia. I look forward to finding out why that was. Lack of government oversight, without any question in my mind, will be a large part of it, just as we're finding out in the oil spill.

This has also been an interesting afternoon of playing charades. I have a 6-year-old granddaughter who loves to play a game with me. She will tell me a tall tale, and then I pretend to believe it. Then, at a moment of her choosing, she says, "Gotcha." Don't let them "getcha" today. What they have been doing here is totally nongermane to this bill. And if you all run up and vote "no" on the previous question, they're not going to bring this up, because they can't.

Don't be taken in by this again. The Obama administration did not create this awful problem, but we're totally aware of it, and we have undertaken responsibility to clean it up. And we're going to do that. As soon as the supplemental bill comes, we're going to have one of the best chances in the world if we start to cut back the money that we're spending on wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, where we've already spent a trillion dollars, lost enormous numbers of our young soldiers, maimed many, many more. And it is time for us to cut that out. That, again, will start, along with other things we are doing, to get this country back on some solid footing.

Let me say to you once again, Please come down here and vote "yes." Don't be fooled by this. I imagine that this is the beginning of every charade every week, sort of like what Mr. PERLMUTTER said about the COMPETES Act. Please don't forget, my colleagues, that twice we tried to vote out that bill to create jobs, put people back to work, and procedural games have killed it, to the great concern of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, to name a couple.

So this afternoon I want you to come down here as quick as you can, wherever you are, and put your "yes" in here so that we can get this done and to give Chairman MILLER the opportunity to use this deposition authority with his staff to get to the bottom of this mine disaster. We have many disasters of all stripes that we're working on, as you know. Don't be held up by what we have been through here today. There's no question about it, it's nongermane.

The material previously referred to by Mr. DREIER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1363

OFFERED BY MR. DREIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1277) to repeal the emergency fund for the TANF program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1277.

(The information contained below was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the

vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here’s how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly’s “American Congressional Dictionary”: “If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business.”

Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 1363, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5128, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 177, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—240

Ackerman	Boucher	Cohen
Adler (NJ)	Boyd	Connolly (VA)
Altmire	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Andrews	Braley (IA)	Cooper
Arcuri	Brown, Corrine	Costa
Baca	Butterfield	Costello
Baird	Capps	Courtney
Baldwin	Capuano	Critz
Barrow	Cardoza	Crowley
Bean	Carnahan	Cuellar
Becerra	Carney	Cummings
Berkley	Carson (IN)	Dahlkemper
Berman	Castor (FL)	Davis (AL)
Berry	Chandler	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Childers	Davis (IL)
Bishop (NY)	Chu	Davis (TN)
Blumenauer	Clarke	DeFazio
Boccieri	Clay	DeGette
Boren	Cleaver	Delahunt
Boswell	Clyburn	DeLauro

Deutch	Langevin	Reyes
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Richardson
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez
Doggett	Lee (CA)	Ross
Doyle	Levin	Rothman (NJ)
Driehaus	Lewis (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Edwards (MD)	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Edwards (TX)	Loeb	Rush
Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (OH)
Ellsworth	Lowe	Salazar
Engel	Lujan	Sanchez, Loretta
Eshoo	Lynch	Sarbanes
Etheridge	Maffei	Schakowsky
Farr	Maloney	Schauer
Fattah	Markey (CO)	Schiff
Finer	Markey (MA)	Schrader
Foster	Marshall	Scott (GA)
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Scott (VA)
Fudge	Matsui	Serrano
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Sestak
Grayson	McCollum	Shea-Porter
Green, Al	McDermott	Sherman
Green, Gene	McGovern	Shuler
Grijalva	McMahon	Sires
Gutierrez	McNerney	Skelton
Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Halvorson	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Hare	Melancon	Snyder
Harman	Michaud	Space
Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)	Speier
Heinrich	Miller, George	Spratt
Herse	Mollohan	Stark
Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Stupak
Higgins	Moore (WI)	Sutton
Hill	Moran (VA)	Tanner
Himes	Murphy (CT)	Teague
Hinche	Murphy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Hinojosa	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (MS)
Hirono	Nadler (NY)	Tierney
Hodes	Napolitano	Titus
Holden	Neal (MA)	Tonko
Holt	Oberstar	Towns
Honda	Obey	Tsongas
Hoyer	Oliver	Van Hollen
Inslee	Ortiz	Velázquez
Israel	Owens	Visclosky
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Walz
Johnson (GA)	Pascarella	Wasserman
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)	Schultz
Kagen	Payne	Waters
Kanjorski	Perlmutter	Watson
Kaptur	Perriello	Watt
Kennedy	Peters	Waxman
Kildee	Peterson	Weiner
Kilpatrick (MI)	Pingree (ME)	Welch
Kilroy	Polis (CO)	Wilson (OH)
Kind	Pomeroy	Woolsey
Kissell	Price (NC)	Wu
Klein (FL)	Quigley	Yarmuth
Kosmas	Rahall	
Kratovil	Rangel	
Kucinich		

NAYS—177

Aderholt	Coble	Heller
Akin	Coffman (CO)	Hensarling
Alexander	Cole	Heger
Austria	Conaway	Hunter
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Inglis
Bartlett	Culberson	Issa
Barton (TX)	Davis (KY)	Jenkins
Biggart	Dent	Johnson (IL)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Donnelly (IN)	Jones
Blackburn	Dreier	Jordan (OH)
Blunt	Duncan	King (IA)
Boehner	Ehlers	King (NY)
Bono Mack	Emerson	Kingston
Boozman	Fallin	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Boustany	Flake	Kline (MN)
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Lamborn
Bright	Forbes	Lance
Brown (GA)	Fortenberry	Latham
Brown (SC)	Fox	LaTourette
Brown-Waite,	Franks (AZ)	Latta
Ginny	Frelinghuysen	Lee (NY)
Buchanan	Gallely	Lewis (CA)
Burgess	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Burton (IN)	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Buyer	Giffords	Lucas
Calvert	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Camp	Gohmert	Lummis
Campbell	Goodlatte	Lungren, Daniel
Cantor	Granger	E.
Cao	Graves	Mack
Capito	Griffith	Manzullo
Carter	Guthrie	Marchant
Cassidy	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (CA)
Castle	Harper	McCaul
Chaffetz	Hastings (WA)	McClintock

McCotter	Platts	Shimkus
McHenry	Poe (TX)	Shuster
McIntyre	Posey	Simpson
McKeon	Price (GA)	Smith (NE)
McMorris	Putnam	Smith (NJ)
Rodgers	Radanovich	Smith (TX)
Mica	Rehberg	Stearns
Miller (FL)	Reichert	Sullivan
Miller (MI)	Roe (TN)	Taylor
Miller, Gary	Rogers (AL)	Terry
Minnick	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Mitchell	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Murphy, Tim	Rooney	Tiberi
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Neugebauer	Roskam	Upton
Nunes	Royce	Walden
Nye	Ryan (WI)	Westmoreland
Olson	Scalise	Whitfield
Paul	Schmidt	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Schock	Wittman
Pence	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Petri	Sessions	Young (AK)
Pitts	Shadegg	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bachus	Gordon (TN)	Sánchez, Linda
Barrett (SC)	Hoekstra	T.
Bilbray	Jackson Lee	Schwartz
Bonner	(TX)	Souder
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk	Wamp
Garamendi		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1608

Messrs. WHITFIELD, GINGREY of Georgia, POSEY, ROGERS of Alabama, JORDAN of Ohio, LEE of New York, SIMPSON, GOHMERT, BROUN of Georgia, EHLERS, BLUNT, INGLIS, OLSON and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CHILDERS changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—413

Ackerman	Bilirakis	Brown, Corrine
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Brown-Waite,
Adler (NJ)	Bishop (NY)	Ginny
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Buchanan
Alexander	Blackburn	Burgess
Altmire	Blumenauer	Burton (IN)
Andrews	Blunt	Butterfield
Arcuri	Boccieri	Buyer
Baca	Boehner	Calvert
Baldwin	Bono Mack	Camp
Barrow	Boozman	Campbell
Bean	Boren	Cantor
Becerra	Boswell	Cao
Berkley	Boucher	Capito
Berman	Boustany	Capps
Berry	Boyd	Capuano
Bishop (GA)	Brady (PA)	Cardoza
Bishop (NY)	Brady (TX)	Carnahan
Blumenauer	Braley (IA)	Carney
Boccieri	Bright	Carson (IN)
Boren	Broun (GA)	Carter
Boswell	Brown (SC)	Cassidy

Castle	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)	Thompson (PA)	Watson	Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Miller (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Watt	Boyd	Gerlach	Marchant
Chaffetz	Hill	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)	Tiahrt	Waxman	Brady (PA)	Giffords	Markey (CO)
Chandler	Himes	Miller, George	Smith (WA)	Tiberi	Weiner	Brady (TX)	Gingrey (GA)	Markey (MA)
Childers	Hinchev	Minnick	Snyder	Tierney	Welch	Bright	Gohmert	Marshall
Chu	Hinojosa	Mitchell	Space	Titus	Westmoreland	Broun (GA)	Gonzalez	Matheson
Clarke	Hirono	Mollohan	Speier	Tonko	Whitfield	Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Matsui
Clay	Hodes	Moore (KS)	Spratt	Towns	Wilson (OH)	Brown, Corrine	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Cleaver	Holden	Moore (WI)	Stark	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)	Brown-Waite,	Graves	McCarthy (NY)
Clyburn	Holt	Moran (KS)	Stearns	Turner	Wittman	Ginny	Grayson	McCaul
Coble	Honda	Moran (VA)	Stupak	Upton	Wolf	Buchanan	Green, Al	McClintock
Coffman (CO)	Hoyer	Murphy (CT)	Sullivan	Van Hollen	Woolsey	Burton (IN)	Green, Gene	McCollum
Cohen	Hunter	Murphy (NY)	Sutton	Velázquez	Wu	Butterfield	Griffith	McCotter
Cole	Inglis	Murphy, Patrick	Tanner	Visclosky	Yarmuth	Buyer	Grijalva	McDermott
Conaway	Inslee	Murphy, Tim	Taylor	Walden	Young (AK)	Calvert	Guthrie	McGovern
Connolly (VA)	Israel	Myrick	Teague	Walz	Young (FL)	Camp	Gutierrez	McHenry
Conyers	Issa	Nadler (NY)	Terry	Wasserman		Campbell	Hall (NY)	McIntyre
Cooper	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)	Schultz		Cantor	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Costa	Jenkins	Neal (MA)	Thompson (MS)	Waters		Cao	Halvorson	McMahon
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer				Capito	Hare	McMorris
Courtney	Johnson (IL)	Nunes				Capps	Harman	Rodgers
Crenshaw	Johnson, E. B.	Nye				Capuano	Harper	McNerney
Critz	Johnson, Sam	Oberstar				Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Crowley	Jones	Obey				Carnahan	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Cuellar	Jordan (OH)	Olson				Carney	Heinrich	Melancon
Culberson	Kagen	Olver	Bachus	Gordon (TN)	Sánchez, Linda	Carson (IN)	Heller	Mica
Cummings	Kanjorski	Ortiz	Barrett (SC)	Hoekstra	T.	Carter	Hensarling	Michaud
Dahlkemper	Kaptur	Owens	Bilbray	Jackson Lee	Schwartz	Cassidy	Herger	Miller (FL)
Davis (AL)	Kennedy	Pallone	Bonner	(TX)	Souder	Castle	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (MI)
Davis (CA)	Kildee	Pascarell	Davis (KY)	Kirk	Wamp	Castor (FL)	Higgins	Miller, Gary
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Pastor (AZ)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Lynch		Chaffetz	Hill	Miller, George
Davis (TN)	Kilroy	Paulsen	Garamendi	Rush		Chandler	Himes	Minnick
DeFazio	Kind	Payne				Childers	Hinchev	Mitchell
DeGette	King (IA)	Pence				Chu	Hirono	Mollohan
Delahunt	King (NY)	Perlmutter				Clarke	Hodes	Moore (WI)
DeLauro	Kingston	Perriello				Clay	Holden	Moran (VA)
Dent	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peters				Cleaver	Holt	Murphy (CT)
Deutch	Kissell	Peterson				Clyburn	Honda	Murphy (NY)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Klein (FL)	Petri				Coble	Hoyer	Murphy, Patrick
Dicks	Kline (MN)	Pingree (ME)				Coffman (CO)	Hunter	Murphy, Tim
Dingell	Kosmas	Pitts				Cohen	Inglis	Myrick
Doggett	Kratovil	Platts				Cole	Inslee	Nadler (NY)
Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich	Poe (TX)				Conaway	Israel	Napolitano
Doyle	Lamborn	Polis (CO)				Connolly (VA)	Issa	Neal (MA)
Dreier	Lance	Pomeroy				Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Neugebauer
Driehaus	Langevin	Posey				Cooper	Jenkins	Nunes
Duncan	Larsen (WA)	Price (GA)				Costa	Johnson (GA)	Nye
Edwards (MD)	Larson (CT)	Price (NC)				Costello	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar
Edwards (TX)	Latham	Putnam				Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Ehlers	LaTourette	Quigley				Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Olson
Ellison	Latta	Radanovich				Critz	Jones	Olver
Ellsworth	Lee (CA)	Rahall				Crowley	Jordan (OH)	Ortiz
Emerson	Lee (NY)	Rangel				Cuellar	Kagen	Owens
Engel	Levin	Rehberg				Culberson	Kanjorski	Pallone
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Reichert				Cummings	Kaptur	Pascarell
Etheridge	Lewis (GA)	Reyes				Dahlkemper	Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)
Fallin	Linder	Richardson				Davis (AL)	Kildee	Paul
Farr	Lipinski	Rodriguez				Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Paulsen
Fattah	LoBiondo	Roe (TN)				Davis (IL)	Kilroy	Payne
Filner	Loeb sack	Rogers (AL)				Davis (TN)	Kind	Pence
Flake	Loftgren, Zoe	Rogers (KY)				DeFazio	King (IA)	Perlmutter
Fleming	Lowey	Rogers (MI)				DeGette	King (NY)	Perriello
Forbes	Lucas	Rohrabacher				Delahunt	Kingston	Peters
Thornberry	Luetkemeyer	Rooney				DeLauro	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Peterson
Foster	Luján	Ros-Lehtinen				Dent	Kissell	Petri
Fox	Lummis	Roskam				Deutch	Klein (FL)	Pingree (ME)
Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Ross				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)	Pitts
Franks (AZ)	E.	Rothman (NJ)				Dicks	Kosmas	Platts
Frelinghuysen	Mack	Roybal-Allard				Dingell	Kratovil	Poe (TX)
Fudge	Maffei	Royce				Doggett	Kucinich	Polis (CO)
Gallegly	Maloney	Ruppersberger				Donnelly (IN)	Lamborn	Pomeroy
Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Ryan (OH)				Doyle	Lance	Posey
Gerlach	Marchant	Ryan (WI)				Dreier	Langevin	Price (GA)
Giffords	Markey (CO)	Salazar				Driehaus	Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)
Gingrey (GA)	Markey (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta				Duncan	Larson (CT)	Putnam
Gohmert	Marshall	Sarbanes				Edwards (MD)	Latham	Quigley
Gonzalez	Matheson	Scalise				Edwards (TX)	LaTourette	Radanovich
Goodlatte	Matsui	Schakowsky				Ehlers	Latta	Rahall
Granger	McCarthy (CA)	Schauer				Ellison	Lee (CA)	Rangel
Graves	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff				Ellsworth	Lee (NY)	Rehberg
Grayson	McCaul	Schmidt				Emerson	Levin	Reichert
Green, Al	McClintock	Schock				Engel	Lewis (CA)	Reyes
Green, Gene	McCollum	Schrader				Eshoo	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Griffith	McCotter	Scott (GA)				Etheridge	Linder	Rodriguez
Grijalva	McDermott	Scott (VA)				Fallin	Lipinski	Roe (TN)
Guthrie	McGovern	Sensenbrenner				Farr	LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)
Gutierrez	McHenry	Serrano				Fattah	Loeb sack	Rogers (KY)
Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Sessions				Filner	Loftgren, Zoe	Rogers (MI)
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Sestak				Flake	Lowey	Rohrabacher
Halvorson	McMahon	Shadegg				Fleming	Lucas	Rooney
Hare	McMorris	Shea-Porter				Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen
Harman	Rodgers	Sherman				Fortenberry	Luján	Roskam
Harper	McNerney	Shimkus				Foster	Lummis	Ross
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Shuler				Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Shuster				Frank (MA)	E.	Roybal-Allard
Heinrich	Melancon	Simpson				Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Royce
Heller	Mica	Sires				Frelinghuysen	Mack	Ruppersberger
Hensarling	Michaud	Skelton				Fudge	Maffei	Rush
Herger	Miller (FL)	Slaughter				Gallegly	Maloney	Ryan (OH)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—17

Bachus	Gordon (TN)	Sánchez, Linda
Barrett (SC)	Hoekstra	T.
Bilbray	Jackson Lee	Schwartz
Bonner	(TX)	Souder
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lynch	
Garamendi	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1615

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEWART LEE UDALL DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5128, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TEAGUE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5128, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

AYES—409

Ackerman	Baldwin	Bishop (NY)
Aderholt	Barrow	Bishop (UT)
Adler (NJ)	Bartlett	Blackburn
Akin	Barton (TX)	Blumenauer
Alexander	Bean	Blunt
Altmire	Becerra	Bocciari
Andrews	Berkley	Boehner
Arcuri	Berman	Bono Mack
Austria	Berry	Boozman
Baca	Biggert	Boren
Bachmann	Bilirakis	Boswell
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Boucher

Ryan (WI)	Smith (NE)	Tsongas
Salazar	Smith (NJ)	Turner
Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (TX)	Upton
Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Van Hollen
Scalise	Snyder	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Space	Visclosky
Schauer	Speier	Walden
Schiff	Spratt	Walz
Schmidt	Stark	Wasserman
Schock	Stearns	Schultz
Schrader	Stupak	Waters
Scott (GA)	Sullivan	Watson
Scott (VA)	Sutton	Watt
Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Waxman
Serrano	Taylor	Weiner
Sessions	Teague	Welch
Sestak	Terry	Westmoreland
Shadegg	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (OH)
Sherman	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wittman
Shuler	Tiahrt	Wolf
Shuster	Tiberi	Woolsey
Simpson	Tierney	Wu
Sires	Titus	Yarmuth
Skelton	Tonko	Young (FL)
Slaughter	Towns	

NOES—1

Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—21

Bachus	Garamendi	Moore (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Moran (KS)
Bilbray	Hinojosa	Sánchez, Linda
Bonner	Hoekstra	T.
Braley (IA)	Jackson Lee	Schwartz
Burgess	(TX)	Souder
Davis (KY)	Kirk	Wamp
Diaz-Balart, M.	Miller (NC)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1623

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the United States Department of the Interior Building in Washington, District of Columbia, as the 'Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 290 taken today, H.R. 5128, to designate the Department of the Interior Building in Washington, DC, as the "Stewart Lee Udall Department of the Interior Building", had I not had a family emergency which required my return to California, I would have proudly voted "yes."

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD OBESITY AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KISSELL). The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 996, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 996, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A resolution expressing support for the designation of September as National Childhood Obesity Awareness Month."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

5-STAR GENERALS
COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1177, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1177, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1339.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1339.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO
CHINA FOR TRAGIC EARTH-
QUAKE IN QINGHAI PROVINCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 1324.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McMAHON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1324.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. CANTOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader, for the purposes of announcing next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the Republican whip for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business, and on Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules, as is usual. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider Senate amendments to H.R. 4213, the American Jobs Closing Tax Loopholes and Preventing Outsourcing Act, and H.R. 5136, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011. And we will take further action on the America COMPETES legislation to make our economy more vibrant.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask, with the Memorial Day recess beginning the week after next, does the gentleman expect the House to be in session next Friday. I yield.

□ 1630

Mr. HOYER. I expect us to reserve that day for session. I have urged Members, and I would urge Members on both sides of the aisle, to reserve that day, not to plan for that day. Clearly, if we can complete the week's business then we will not have to meet.

But I remind the gentleman, as I am sure he knows, there are a number of items that have expiration dates either on the 31st of May or the 1st of June: unemployment insurance, COBRA health insurance, the sustainable growth rate for doctors' reimbursement for services, and other items that are critical to continue. So that I do not want to give away Friday because it is the last day we will be here for 10 days, and therefore we need to address those issues.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman indicated, the Defense authorization bill is coming to the floor next week. Usually, I think Members expect several days' worth of debate on a variety of amendments. Typically, there are a large number of amendments made in order.

I would ask the gentleman, does he expect the House to follow that general precedent on the Defense authorization and the lengthy number of amendments and discussion on the House floor next week?

Mr. HOYER. We expect to take such time as is necessary to complete the appropriate debate on that bill. If we can do it in 1 day, we will do it in 1

day. If it takes more than that, we will allot more time.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items the gentleman did not mention for next week's schedule, including a budget resolution as well as a troop funding supplemental. I would like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, whether he expects either of these two items to come to the floor next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question and for yielding. With respect to the budget, as the gentleman knows, I personally want to see a budget move forward. Mr. SPRATT has been working very hard to try to see if we can reach consensus on the parameters of such a budget. He continues to do that. I frankly want to tell the gentleman honestly that my assessment is that that probably will not be done by Thursday or Wednesday of next week, and therefore even if it were completed Wednesday, not appropriate time for notice to be given. So that my expectation is that will not be done next week, but my expectation is that we will continue to work on that, and hopefully do that shortly after our return.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. You asked another question I didn't answer. I apologize. On the war supplemental, very important bill that I know the gentleman and I are very interested in. As you know, the Senate has marked up its supplemental in committee. Chairman OBEY I know is working to get a bill ready for committee consideration. It is possible that we would consider that next week if, in fact, Mr. OBEY and the committee are ready to report that out.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the House voted today on the first YouCut proposal. It was a spending cut selected by the American people. Unfortunately, only nine Members from the gentleman's side of the aisle joined with all Republicans in voting to save the taxpayers \$2.5 billion. I wish more Members of the Democratic Caucus had voted with Republicans.

The good news is Members will have the opportunity to vote on another cut again next week. Right now as we speak, Mr. Speaker, Americans are casting their votes at Republicanwhip.house.gov/YouCut for what they would like the House to cut next week.

So, in keeping with the gentleman's announcement about next week's floor schedule, I would like to announce that the House will vote on one of these five spending cut proposals next week: first, to eliminate the Byrd Honor Scholarship Program, a \$420 million item for savings; second, stop the proposed Federal employee pay raise next year, a potential \$30 billion worth of savings; third, to suspend the Federal land purchases, a \$2.6 billion potential savings, Mr. Speaker; fourth, an ability to terminate U.S. funding for UNESCO, a potential item for \$810 million worth of

savings to the taxpayers; or fifth, a move to eliminate mohair subsidies, something that would save the taxpayers \$10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would say again, the gentleman knows about this program. It is nothing but an attempt for us to try and change the culture here in Washington towards one of saving taxpayer dollars. Reducing the budget deficit should be a bipartisan effort, and we would hope that the gentleman and his colleagues could join with us as we bring up the next YouCut proposal next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. BOEHNER and I did attempt to pursue some meaningful restraints last week, and unfortunately, we couldn't get agreement to do so on your side of the aisle. Having said that, we certainly agree that we need to get a handle on the extraordinary deficit picture that confronts us.

I know I am repetitive, but in 2001, President Bush came before the Congress and said we have a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Unfortunately, that \$5.6 trillion surplus was eliminated, and in fact, \$5 trillion of additional deficit was incurred, giving us a \$10 trillion deficit when this administration took over. That's unfortunate.

I will tell the gentleman, as he knows, he and others have voted for trillions, that's with a T, of dollars of unfunded liabilities for the Federal Government, either reduction in revenues, which of course you say will grow the economy—unfortunately, it did not—or a prescription drug bill which was not paid for which was hundreds of billions of dollars, not minimal dollars. But I will tell the gentleman that we are interested in working with you in a meaningful way, not in procedural vote ways, but in meaningful ways to reduce the deficit that confronts us, including reducing areas of spending, which we think is appropriate.

With respect to the motion that you made today, a procedural motion, if it hadn't been a procedural motion, maybe a real motion—and of course many of those programs were in existence for the 12 years that you controlled the Congress of the United States, as the gentleman well knows. The motion today, of course, would have affected a program which is going to create, we believe, 185,000 jobs. We think that's important in an economy that is still struggling to get jobs back. But we applaud the efforts to bring forward meaningful, important ideas. Unfortunately, that has not always been our experience.

I am sure you read there have been a lot of motions to recommit that have been made. Now we are onto previous questions now, but motions to recommit. Norm Ornstein wrote an article about those just the other day in which he said, The unfortunate fact is that the motion to recommit with instructions has for more than a decade become a hollow vehicle and farce. Now, the American people don't want to see us participate in hollow vehicles and

farces. What they want to see is us work together in real ways to effect the kind of fiscal responsibility that we had in the nineties, and unfortunately we did not have in the last decade. We need to return to that.

We have, as you know, taken very substantive steps. One was to pay for what we buy—not a previous question—legislation on this floor which said we are going to pay for what we buy. That was in place in the nineties, put in place in a bipartisan way with Mr. Bush and Mr. Gephardt leading the way and others. Again adopted in a bipartisan way with Mr. Gingrich and President Clinton working together. And then of course jettisoned under not your personal leadership, but under the leadership of the Republican Party in 2001, 2002, 2003, formally jettisoned in 2003, in which we said, no, we don't believe that paying for what we buy is the policy that we are going to pursue. And in fact you didn't pursue it. You created large deficits every year that you controlled the Congress: the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. Every year without fail.

So I tell my friend that we want to join together in real efforts. We are sorry that in a partisan way PAYGO was jettisoned. We are also sorry that the commission that the President established by Executive order didn't pass because so many of your colleagues in the Senate who said they were for the idea of setting up a commission to propose real restraint in spending, not only in terms of discretionary dollars but in terms of entitlement dollars, that so many of your colleagues in the Senate opposed that, and as result we don't have a statutory commission, we have a Presidentially appointed commission.

I am hopeful that they will make substantive recommendations. I am hopeful that our Members and your Members will join together in making recommendations to us. And as you know, both Mr. REID, the leader in the Senate, and Speaker PELOSI have indicated that we will put their recommendations on the floor. If the Senate passes them, we will put them on the floor here. Hopefully, we can work together toward the end that I think we both seek even though there may be disagreement on the process that is being pursued.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman loves to talk about spending under the Bush years and under the years that our party controlled Congress. But I find it somewhat ironic at this point to go on talking about the inability to control spending when it is his party and the majority currently that is unable to produce a budget. He and I have had discussions again about the inability of this House to do its work, and in fact, I know the gentleman recalls, because it has been reported before that he himself says that when we are unable to pass a budget, and I quote, "it is failing to meet the most basic responsibility of governing, that is enacting a budget."

In the same way, the gentleman's chairman of the Budget Committee from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) said, quote, "If you can't budget, you can't govern. In a parliamentary system it's more than an adage."

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I was just going to say that I still agree with both of those statements, Mr. SPRATT's and my own.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate that. I would say instead of casting stones and pointing blame and saying you too did this, I believe that it is most important for us to recognize now the failure of this body to do what the American people expect us to do to control spending, and that is to produce a budget.

Mr. Speaker, I go on to say the gentleman was quick to, if I could say, malign the attempt to reduce the \$2.4 billion program under the expanded welfare program under the stimulus bill that we just had a vote on. But I would point out that there were nine Members on his side of the aisle—Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. TAYLOR—these individual Members felt that perhaps we were and did have a valid point to make, that we ought to be cutting spending right now.

I would say to the gentleman, perhaps he is suggesting that these individuals voted to kill 185,000 jobs. I wouldn't say that those Members tried to do that in that vote. Again, I would just ask the gentleman whether that was his intention. I would probably think he wouldn't think his Members would vote to kill jobs.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think there is a lot of concern, not necessarily on these Members' parts, and we all know this, about 30-second simplistic "gotcha" ads on television which don't discuss the substance of the ramifications of actions. The bill that passed passed overwhelmingly. The previous question would have stopped that bill going forward. Obviously, when you were in control you wanted the previous question passed so you could move your substantive legislation forward. There is no difference over here. But the "gotcha" ads certainly are something that in the minds of everybody on both sides of the aisle—

Mr. CANTOR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, there are no "gotcha" ads here. There was a statement made by the gentleman that said that the program that we were attempting to cut was a program that could create or has created 185,000 jobs. I just say to the gentleman, nine of his Members voted with us on that vote, and I would ask the gentleman does he think those nine Members voted to kill 185,000 jobs the way he in his statement sort of implied that Republicans intended to do?

□ 1645

Mr. HOYER. Well, first of all, we don't believe this is a real vote. Our Members don't believe it's a real vote. Our Members are cognizant of why it's being done. But the 185,000 jobs, clearly, those nine Members that you referenced did not vote to eliminate 185,000 jobs. But all your Members did. The difference is because you are not going to run ads against your Members.

The fact of the matter is that if you want to do real things to create real jobs, we're prepared to work with you. We believe the program you wanted to eliminate does in fact score at creating 185,000 jobs. You call it welfare. We call it work. We think it was an appropriate expenditure. As a matter of fact, as the gentleman may know, we have that expenditure in our jobs bill. Why? Because it's scored to create 185,000 jobs, put people to work, allow them to support their families, allow them to live with some degree of dignity. And we think that's appropriate in a very, very strained economy to this date.

We're coming back, but as we've seen lately, it is fragile and this gum, grease, and oil has caused us problems in terms of confidence. And we need to keep confidence up and not make the mistakes that have been made in the past.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman that obviously we have a real difference and the program we propose to cut is number one. The kind of debate that we're having should be the kind of debate we are having on this floor every day—not voting for post offices and naming Federal buildings.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that particular point?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. As you know, I schedule the legislation. Are you asking me not to schedule the 40 percent of those post office bills that your Members are requesting? Because if you are, I will not schedule them.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, what I am asking the gentleman to do is to work with us in bringing to the floor and scheduling bills that actually reduce spending here in Washington because the gentleman indicated that he knows why all of this is being done, and I think that perhaps maybe he's thinking it's being done under the old construct.

Where we are now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is that the American people expect some accountability here in Washington. They want us to stop spending money we don't have. The reason we launched the YouCut program is, number one, we want to say to the American people, we're listening, that we're not setting aside their wishes and their desires, that we care about what they think. That's what YouCut is all about. It's about empowering folks to go online and to tell us what they think, given the options presented to cut the Federal budget deficit. That's why we're doing this program,

Mr. Speaker, and that's what YouCut is all about.

I would say to the gentleman, not one bill on the floor this week cut a single dollar from the Federal deficit. That's why we brought this proposal up.

Now, as to why we chose the PQ, I think the gentleman knows that the rules put in place and make it so that the minority has no other way to posit their alternatives or posit wishes that we may have other than to use a PQ, and that's why we elected to do this. If the gentleman wants to schedule a bill that we are discussing on substantive grounds, that's what we're about. Bring these bills to the floor for open and fair debate.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, he mentions the disappointment that he has over some on our side of the aisle and the other side of this building in not supporting the President's commission addressing the fiscal outlook for this country. The gentleman knows well the reason many Members on our side of the aisle refused to participate in that vote was because, in fact, the focus was not going to be on that commission cutting spending.

We think that Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem here. So why couldn't we just set aside the need for additional revenues, put that off the table, and focus on spending?

Again, that's what the YouCut program is about. That's why we're bringing these things to the floor, and I would hope that the gentleman could join us in demonstrating that we're listening to the people and actually moving towards a sense of fiscal discipline here in Washington.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I ask the gentleman, there is a Member on your side of the aisle who has, in my opinion, a very thoughtful, courageous, and substantive proposal. I happen not to agree with it, but I think it is a courageous, intellectually honest proposal. And that is Mr. RYAN, who's the ranking member of the Budget Committee. If the gentleman would like us to put that budget on the floor—which is from his chair when he was in the majority of the Budget Committee—that is a really substantive proposal. Again, I don't agree with it, but I think it intellectually is an honest, effective proposal to deal with a very serious problem, not a little problem, but a trillion-dollar problem; not a little problem that sounds good in sound bites but is not going to get us to where we need to be.

I think Mr. RYAN has such a proposal, and I certainly would urge the chairman of the Budget Committee to agree to make sure that's on the floor because I believe that is a substantive proposal. The gentleman says we don't put his substantive proposals on the

floor. That's made by the ranking member of the Budget Committee, one of the leaders of his party, representing your party on the Budget Committee. And I would be glad to make arrangements to have that proposal on the floor.

Would the gentleman want me to do that?

Mr. CANTOR. I say to the Speaker, the gentleman suggests that our ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN's roadmap proposal, is the budget. That is not the budget. That's a 75-year document. The gentleman, I think, knows, if he's looked at that, it is a plan to try and address the very real fiscal challenges that this country faces.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with that.

Mr. CANTOR. And our job here in this Congress is to go about trying to address the problems through the processes that his party has put in place.

Right now, priority one should be a budget. Okay. So if the gentleman is suggesting that perhaps we bring Mr. RYAN's roadmap bill to the floor, a 75-year document, how is that even something that we could expect is a serious gesture to do something about the fiscal needs this country has when his party can't even produce a budget for this fiscal year?

So again I say, Mr. Speaker, let's get serious now. There are a lot of things we can agree on. The budget cut that we brought to the floor today is something that I believe, up-or-down, if his Members were given the opportunity to vote on again and think about without being tainted by some accusation that it may not be for real, these are cuts that are serious. We've got to start somewhere, and the American people have said start here.

So this is what we're about, Mr. Speaker, and I'd ask the gentleman to work with us and bring these types of cuts to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. If the gentleman is really saying that \$2.5 billion is not something that we could start with—as if that's no money. I know he doesn't mean that. And only in Washington somehow has that become a sense that \$2.5 billion is not real money. Of course it is.

But we've got to find ways to work together. And if the gentleman says he'll bring up this bill but he can't support it, then the purpose is not for us to work together. We've got to work together to find a way to solve these problems.

And I'll yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I take that as a "no," that you're not interested in having that bill brought up.

But \$2.5 billion is a lot of money, and to the extent we cut \$2.5 billion or \$2.5 million, we ought to do it. You are going to have an opportunity to vote on that \$2.4 billion, 185,000 job-creation

bill probably next week. We're going to have it on the floor. So you'll have a chance to vote on that, I tell my friend.

We do want to work together. And the reason I keep bringing up is not to blame—I said this a couple of weeks ago—not to blame, but to point out the failure of the premise under which you have operated to do what you said it was going to do: create jobs, lower the deficit. In fact, it did the opposite. We followed that economic policy for 6 years. The American public said, We don't like this. And we couldn't change it because President Bush didn't want to change it.

In 2008, they said, We want new leadership. Unfortunately, the legacy we were left was the deepest economic recession as a result of those policies that this country has seen in 75 years. We're trying to dig out. It's difficult to dig out. We have a responsibility, however, to make the tough decisions to dig out.

You and I made a tough decision at President Bush's request in September. In February, we had to make another tough decision. You and I disagreed on that, and that was trying to put money into the economy, trying to stabilize it and bring jobs back. I suggest to the gentleman that that is working. It's not working as well as we would have liked, but we've had 4 months of job growth. Those 4 months, if they're replicated over the next two-thirds of the year, would create more jobs than were created in the 96 months of the Bush administration—1.7 million jobs. One million were created during the entire 8 years of the Bush administration, net.

We have a hole. We need to dig out. The gentleman is absolutely correct: to the extent that we dig together, America will be better. We want to do that.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman. Again, I would respond by saying it is just not all that black and white, and he knows it. There is no way that the blame for what happened can go singly to one party, one administration, or what have you. We all have to come here with the best of intentions to work together and to point to the good in this country and what made us who we are, and that is the freedom and the economic freedom afforded by our system.

Those are the principles by which we come to this building, Mr. Speaker. And some of us have a strong objection to the increasing sense that somehow we've got all of the answers here in Washington, that we don't have to listen to the people.

I'm glad to hear that the gentleman is going to bring some YouCut proposals to the floor. That's a great start. We need to keep listening to the people, doing what it is they expect, which is to get the Federal spending under control.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I look forward to working with Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTOR. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. What I said was we'll bring the proposal to create those jobs to the floor—not to cut it, but to spend it because we believe that that will create 185,000 jobs. So I just didn't want to be misconstrued in what I said.

The gentleman will have an opportunity to vote against that, of course.

Mr. CANTOR. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for misunderstanding the gentleman.

I would respond to that statement then by saying the American people have told us to stop spending, to stop spending money we don't have. And that's the purpose for our sponsoring this provision today, the purpose for our launching YouCut, and we will expect to continue to have the votes on listening to the American people to begin to cut the Federal deficit.

But, again, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I look forward to working with the gentleman from Maryland in a fiscally responsible manner which, again, we would hope starts with passing a budget blueprint this year, making some of the tough decisions to cut spending just like the American families and small business people are doing as we speak.

And with that, I thank the gentleman for his time, and I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 21, 2010, TO MONDAY, MAY 24, 2010

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate; and further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 25, 2010, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE MARK E. SOUDER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable MARK E. SOUDER, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you that I have sent the enclosed letter to Governor Mitch Daniels of Indiana resigning my office as the United States Representative for the Third District of Indiana, effective Friday, May 21, 2010.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve the people of Indiana.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2020.

Hon. MITCH DANIELS,
Governor,
State of Indiana.

I write to inform you that effective Friday, May 21, 2010, I resign from the office of the United States Representatives for the Third Congressional District of Indiana.

It has been an honor and privilege to serve the people of Indiana.

Sincerely,

MARK E. SOUDER,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.,
MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JESSE L. JACKSON, Jr., Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 20, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I write to formally notify you that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in a criminal case pending there.

While it is unclear at this time whether the testimony sought "relates to the official functions of the House" within the meaning of Rule VIII.1 of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I am electing to notify the House of the subpoena out of an abundance of caution.

After consultation with counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JESSE L. JACKSON, JR.,
Member of Congress.

□ 1700

FIFTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF
BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 56th anniversary of the Supreme Court ruling of *Brown v. Board of Education*. It was a landmark case known throughout this country for putting an end to segregated schools.

The case was argued before the Supreme Court by the chief counsel for the NAACP, Thurgood Marshall. The decision by the Justices was unanimous when they declared that the State laws establishing separate public schools for black and white students was unconstitutional.

There followed a period of national debate and unrest over the decision. Then, in 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which emphasized equal access to education and established high standards and accountability in schools.

Fifty-six years after *Brown* and 45 years after the first ESEA, we are not

finished with our common goal of education equity for all students, whether they attend schools in the inner city or rural America.

As we contemplate ESEA reauthorization, I call upon my colleagues here in the House to support a world-class education system that provides every student with the opportunity to live up to his or her individual potential regardless of race, class, or geographic location. This would be the greatest and best remembrance of this landmark case.

HONORING REV. BOBBY JOHNSON,
FIRST ASSEMBLY OF GOD, VAN
BUREN

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pastor Bobby L. Johnson for 30 years of leadership at Van Buren's First Assembly of God.

Under Pastor Johnson's guidance, First Assembly of God has enjoyed much success, and it continues to reach new heights. From revivals and youth camps to ministers' retreats and mission crusades, Pastor Johnson's message resonates with community members, both young and old. Its Sunday school program, which started with 270 students, now has more than 2,000 students. In addition, its campus houses a retirement center, which enables it to reach more seniors.

Pastor Johnson has served in the ministry for many years and has touched the lives of countless individuals, including myself. In addition to being pastor at First Assembly of God, Pastor Johnson serves as a General Presbyter of the Assemblies of God. Prior to joining the First Assembly of God, Van Buren, he served as the Arkansas District Assemblies of God Youth Director.

Mr. Speaker, Pastor Johnson's dedication to spreading the gospel is unparalleled; his leadership is unsurpassed. I ask that my colleagues recognized Pastor Johnson for his commitment and service to the ministry and continued success.

WORLD TRADE WEEK

(Ms. BEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my fellow New Dems to highlight the value of trade and exports to our economy. During World Trade Week, it is important for America to demonstrate our commitment to competing and leading in the global marketplace.

To bolster economic recovery and build sustainable economic growth and employment opportunities, America cannot cede emerging markets to our global competitors. Instead, we must

recognize, target, and seek to gain share in high-growth, high-population markets.

Trade agreements that give American workers and products access to new markets, and greater share, are critical to removing barriers to sustainable growth and competitiveness. By ensuring these agreements do not disadvantage American employers but, instead, create a level playing field and are enforced, American innovation and work ethic can and will prevail in the global economy.

I applaud and support the President's National Export Initiative to double our exports in the next 5 years, and I encourage the administration and Congress to resolve remaining issues and move forward on passage of the pending trade agreements. New Dems look forward to working with the administration to do just that.

YOUTUT

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Rules Committee, we met the newest ploy of the Republicans, YouCut.

The rule under consideration was to grant deposition authority to the staff of Ed and Labor regarding the safety issues surrounding the tragic loss of life and limb of coal miners. Enter YouCut.

So-called 240,000 Americans voted on the Internet. The Republicans then chose to offer an amendment to the previous question so that we could not go forward on substantive business, and to cut poor people's opportunities.

First, this is not "American Idol" or "Dancing With the Stars." This is America's legislature. For all we know, on YouCut, Osama bin Laden could be voting.

Please know that not a handful of organized "gotcha" Republicans are going to control this legislature.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

COMMENTS OF MR. RAND PAUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise because I love America. No one loves the Constitution more than I. No one recites the Pledge of Allegiance with greater spirit than I. No one loves the Declaration of Independence more than I.

I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I was shocked last night beyond belief

when I heard the comments of a person who has been nominated for the Senate of the United States of America. I heard the comments of one Mr. Rand Paul, and his comments were shocking because his comments caused me to reflect on a bygone era that I would hate to see us return to.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I have sat in the back of the bus even when there were seats available up near the front. I have had to go to the backdoor to get my food even when there was a facility with no one inside. I have had to drink my water from colored water fountains even when there were other water fountains available, and we had to have a line to go to the colored water fountain. I have had to suffer the indignation and humiliation that segregation imposes upon a person.

I was shocked because I could not believe that a person nominated for the Senate of the United States of America could not say that he would support continuing what we have already fought for and won, and that is, to have persons of color go in the front door at a private facility.

I was shocked. I am still shocked. And I come before this House today not to condemn the person. I don't condemn people, but I do condemn what they do. I condemn what they say.

I come before this House today not to condemn him but, rather, to give him the opportunity to explain himself. And I admonish him that if he does not explain himself, others will explain his position. Either he will explain his position or others will do it for him. I believe that he should explain it, and he should do it with words that are as conspicuously clear as possible, because what he has said is painful to those of us who had to endure these indignations and these humiliations.

I was one of those persons who grew up in the 1960s. I know what it is like to have to do the things that we would have to revisit should he have his way, based upon what I have heard. But maybe he was not given a fair opportunity, and there is time now for him to do for himself what others will do for him if he does not.

I do not know the person who hosts the show "Morning Joe," but I think that he made a significant point. He said that he has 24 hours to explain himself.

I accept the 24-hour pronouncement, and I beg that, within the next 24 hours, that he will explain himself so that we will not misunderstand that on one hand he says he would march with Dr. King but, on the other hand, he does not say that he would allow me, a Member of the House of Representatives in the greatest country in the world, to continue to enter the front door of a private business.

It is a painful revelation. It is a past that we don't like talking about, but it is a past that I had to suffer and live through. And I beg that my colleagues understand that this is no attempt to defeat him in his election. That is for the people of Kentucky.

But there is an attempt to give a person the opportunity to speak up, to stand up and stand for what this country has made possible by virtue of the great and noble ideals presented in the Declaration of Independence: All persons are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I beg that the gentleman will honor my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OIL SPILL IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that I speak here today, thousands of gallons of oil will burst out of a broken well in the floor of the Gulf of Mexico. That oil will add to a catastrophic spill that is now spreading across a widening swath of ocean, coming ashore in Louisiana and devastating the economy of the gulf coast. Every attempt to cap the gusher has thus far failed, and it seems we can anticipate several more months of damage to our coastline, our fisheries, and our environment.

As a Nation, we have been on an oil binge since the 1850s, when we started running out of our previous nonrenewable energy resource, whale oil. The wide-scale destruction that the whale hunts of the 19th century visited on our seas is now mirrored by the damage that offshore drilling is visiting upon the gulf.

Two decades ago, Congress first recognized the danger of offshore drilling and passed a moratorium banning it outside of Alaska and the gulf.

In California, many will remember the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill that spewed out almost 100,000 barrels of oil over 8 days. Lax safety standards and corner-cutting were the immediate culprits in that spill, but the gulf spill shows that, even with today's advanced technology, offshore drilling is fundamentally dangerous.

□ 1715

Thousands of gallons of oil is spilled each year during normal operations.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita sent over half a million gallons into the Gulf. And even without spills, piping and on-shore operations destroy wetlands, disturb wildlife, and limit tourism. Californians are not willing to risk our tourism and fishing industries or our pristine environment with additional offshore drilling, and I'm happy that the Governor has stepped back from his plan for more drilling off the coast near Santa Barbara. Instead of more drilling and more spills, Californians are leading the way to a high-tech, clean energy future.

A few blocks from my office in Pasadena, you'll find a business incubator that has turned clean-energy ideas into successful companies employing hundreds of Americans. One of these companies is now deploying modular concentrating solar power stations in the Mojave Desert, using mass-produced panels and modern manufacturing techniques to create some of the cheapest solar power in the world. Others are working on more efficient solar cells for rooftops and many other revolutionary technologies.

This kind of technological innovation isn't limited to Southern California. Renewable energy is booming in Texas and Massachusetts, South Dakota and Georgia. And with the first mass-produced plug-in hybrid cars appearing this fall, clean energy will soon be fueling our vehicles as well. But our American-made high-tech boom is threatened by subsidies that keep fossil fuel prices artificially low, stifling competition and sustaining our dangerous dependence on foreign oil. Some of those subsidies are directed, like tax breaks for oil companies. The administration's budget proposes ending \$45 billion worth of subsidies that tilt the playing field away from clean energy.

Other subsidies are indirect, like limited liability for oil spills and air pollution. In the L.A. Basin, endemic smog caused by fossil fuels is a hidden tax on every resident, costing millions of dollars in additional health care and lost work hours. Last year, the National Academy of Sciences estimated that health care and other costs created by gasoline consumption come to about 30 cents a gallon, without considering global warming. That cost is absorbed by all of us in the form of hospital bills and asthma attacks. We must rebalance our energy subsidies so that clean energy can compete on an equal footing with oil, coal, and natural gas.

We need to act quickly because China is now a leader in clean energy technology. In a few short years, the Chinese have developed a vibrant industrial base that produces more photovoltaic cells than any other nation. Meanwhile, China's demand continues to grow. It's the world leader in hydropower, second in wind power, stimulating a job-intensive domestic industry to meet the demand. To boost its green economy, China created a stimulus package worth hundreds of billions of dollars. And Chinese universities and research centers are quickly

gaining expertise in developing the green technologies that will power economic growth for upcoming decades.

We can recapture our leadership role by supporting renewable energy companies here at home, realigning our energy incentives, and investing in research and development that will create new technologies. This week, we considered the America COMPETES Act, which outlines a doubling of Federal research over the next decade. Although this bill is opposed by those that favor the same energy sources now devastating the Gulf, I'm confident we will pass this critical measure, and with this investment we will ensure that new energy ideas are created here at home by American students and American entrepreneurs. But we must also ensure these ideas are turned into American companies, providing green-tech business with the tools it needs to grow, train, and hire workers. We must establish renewable energy standards like the one in California that is stimulating investment up and down our State.

Mr. Speaker. In the short time I speak here today, thousands of gallons of oil will burst out of a broken well in the floor of the Gulf of Mexico. That oil will add to a catastrophic spill that is now spreading across a widening swath of ocean, coming ashore in Louisiana, and devastating the economy of the Gulf Coast. Every attempt to cap the gusher has failed, and it seems we can anticipate several more months of damage to our coastline, our fisheries and our environment.

As a nation, we have been on an oil binge since the 1850s, when we started running out of our previous nonrenewable energy resource—whale oil. The wide-scale destruction that the whale hunts of the 19th century visited on our seas is now mirrored by the damage that offshore drilling is visiting upon the Gulf.

Two decades ago, Congress first recognized the danger of offshore drilling and passed a moratorium banning it outside Alaska and the Gulf. In California, many will remember the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill that spewed out almost 100,000 barrels of oil over eight days. Lax safety standards and corner-cutting were the immediate culprits in that spill, but the Gulf spill shows us that even with today's advanced technology, offshore drilling is fundamentally dangerous. Thousands of gallons of oil is spilled each year during normal operations. Hurricanes Katrina and Rita sent over half a million gallons into the Gulf. And even without spills, piping and onshore operations destroy wetlands, disturb wildlife and limit tourism.

Californians are not willing to risk our tourism and fishing industries, or our pristine environment, with additional off-shore drilling, and I'm happy that the governor has stepped back from his plan for more drilling off the coast near Santa Barbara. Instead of more drilling, and more spills, Californians are leading the way to a high-tech, clean energy future.

A few blocks from my office in Pasadena, you'll find a business incubator that has helped turn clean-energy ideas into successful companies employing hundreds of Americans. One of these companies is now deploying modular concentrating solar power stations in

the Mojave Desert, using mass-produced panels and modern manufacturing techniques to create some of the cheapest solar power in the world. Others are working on more efficient solar cells for rooftops, and many other revolutionary technologies.

This kind of technological innovation isn't limited to Southern California—renewable energy is booming in Texas and Massachusetts, South Dakota and Georgia. And with the first mass produced plug-in hybrid cars appearing this fall, clean energy will soon be fueling our vehicles as well.

But our American-made high-tech boom is threatened by subsidies that keep fossil fuel prices artificially low, stifling competition and sustaining our dangerous dependence on foreign oil. Some of those subsidies are direct, like tax breaks for oil companies. The Administration's budget has proposed ending \$45 billion worth of subsidies that tilt the playing field away from clean energy.

Other subsidies are indirect, like limited liability for oil spills and air pollution. In the Los Angeles basin, endemic smog caused by fossil fuels is a hidden tax on every resident, costing millions of dollars in additional health care and lost work hours. Last year, the National Academy of Sciences estimated that health care and other costs created by gasoline consumption come to about 30 cents a gallon, without considering global warming. That cost is absorbed by all of us, in the form of hospital bills and asthma attacks. We must rebalance our energy subsidies so that clean energy can compete on an equal footing with oil, coal and natural gas.

And we need to adapt quickly, because China is now the leader in clean-energy technology. In a few short years, the Chinese have developed a vibrant industrial base that produces more photovoltaic cells than any other nation. Meanwhile, China's demand continues to grow—it is the world leader in hydropower and second in wind power, stimulating a job-intensive domestic industry to meet the demand. To boost its green economy, China created a stimulus package worth hundreds of billions of dollars. And Chinese universities and research centers are quickly gaining expertise in developing the new green technologies that will power economic growth for upcoming decades.

We can recapture our leadership role by supporting renewable energy companies here at home, realigning our energy incentives, and investing in the research and development that will create new technologies. This week, we considered the America COMPETES Act, which outlines a doubling of federal research over the next decade. Although this bill is opposed by those that favor the same energy sources now devastating the Gulf, I am confident we will pass this critical measure. And with this investment, we will ensure that new energy ideas are created here at home, by American students and American entrepreneurs.

But we also must ensure that those ideas turn into American companies. We must provide green-tech business with the tools they need to grow, train and hire new workers. We must establish renewable energy standards, like the one in California that is stimulating investment up and down the state. We must strengthen our electrical grid, so that new sources of energy can be added without stressing the system. And we must update our

electrical meters, so that homeowners can pay less if they shift some of their energy use to off-peak hours.

Our new whale oil has lasted longer than the original, but it is easy to see now that it no longer makes sense, for our economy, for our national security, or for our environment. We face a challenge we can and will meet, but it is not one we can face if we put our heads in the sand and invest more money, lives and effort in the last century's energy source. Instead we must move forward to the new renewable energy future, that awaits us—the most industrious and inventive nation on Earth.

PIRATES ON THE LAKE—PAGE 2

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, heavily armed Mexican pirates have been shaking down U.S. boaters on Falcon Lake in Texas. It's a reservoir and a bass fishing haven that straddles the Rio Grande River in Texas—between Texas and Mexico. It's the international boundary between Zapata County, Texas, and Mexico.

According to recent San Antonio news reports, several such incidents have been reported with pirates on Falcon Lake since April 30, the latest being this past Sunday. According to the Texas Department of Public Safety, which issued warnings Tuesday, the robberies are linked to northern Mexico's increasing lawlessness. According to the descriptions of the incidents, the pirates in at least one case posed as Mexican federal law enforcement officers. They searched fishermen's boats for guns and drugs and then demanded cash at gunpoint. According to the Texas Department of Public Safety, the robbers are believed to be members of a drug trafficking organization or members of an enforcer group linked to a drug trafficking organization. They use AK-47s or AR-15 rifles to threaten their victims. They appear to be using local Mexican fishermen to operate the boats to rob the American fishermen.

It was unclear why sport fishermen were targeted, but the warning comes only a few weeks before bass fishing tournaments that are among the south Texas border region's biggest tourist draws. DPS spokesman Tom Vinger said the warning was issued, in part, because of the upcoming bass tournaments. Zapata County Sheriff Sigi Gonzalez said he would be reviewing protective measures with the DPS Border Security Operations Center and the region's Fusion Center, which is a Federal information clearinghouse for terrorism prevention.

Reported victims included, one, five people in two boats who were approached by four men on April 30, claiming to be federales near the church at Old Guerrero. That is now a submerged town in the bottom of the lake. The men boarded the boats, demanded cash, and wanted to know

where the drugs were. They then robbed the Americans.

A second incident. Three fishermen were approached on May 6 by a boat containing two men pointing AR-15s. Those are assault rifles, Mr. Speaker. One boarded the fishing boat, searched for drugs, cash and guns, chambered a round in the rifle and told the fishermen he would shoot them if they did not give him the money. In another pirate raid, fishermen were robbed of their money and boat and clothes and left naked on the Mexican side of the lake. Yet in a fourth incident, boaters on the U.S. side of the lake were approached by a boat containing five armed men. It's still unclear what else happened because this just happened 2 days ago.

Falcon Lake is approximately 60 miles long. It's a reservoir on the Rio Grande, fronting Starr and Zapata Counties in Texas, and it is shared between the United States and Mexico. It was formed by a dam in 1953 to conserve water for agriculture and control downstream flooding.

Mr. Speaker, piracy is a centuries-old problem that many nations have had to deal with. In the 1800s, Thomas Jefferson sent the United States Navy to the Mediterranean Sea, where pirates roamed at will and robbed American ships. That President fought piracy on the high seas. But the difference now is our administration would rather criticize people in States like Arizona that demand more border security rather than do anything about illegal border crossers, including the pirates of Falcon Lake.

Meanwhile, today, President Calderon of Mexico arrogantly lectured us in a joint session of Congress, chastising the United States—especially Arizona—for passing legislation trying to prevent people from illegally coming into the United States. Mr. Speaker, when 65 percent of the American people support Arizona's new law regarding illegal immigration, his comments were disingenuous and disrespectful to our Nation.

I commend President Calderon for fighting the international drug cartels in his Nation, but the President of Mexico should deal with his own issues and solve Mexico's economic problems, human rights problems, organized crime problems, violence problems, government corruption problems, and illegal immigration problems before President Calderon lectures anybody about anything.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

H.R. 5353, THE WAR IS MAKING YOU POOR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 5353, the War is Making You Poor Act. The War is Making You Poor Act does three things: First, it requires the administration to carry out the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan with only—only—the \$549 billion set forth in the President's budget for defense spending, without the additional \$159 billion the President has asked for for the sake of the so-called emergency war, which now stretches on to 9 years in one case and 7 years in the other. My view is that \$549 billion is enough for these wars or any other wars the President plans to engage in.

What this does, secondly, is that it takes the money that is saved from the war separate allocation and it uses that for a very important purpose with our economy the way it is and people in America suffering. It takes that money—or 90 percent of it—and it uses that to make \$35,000 of everyone's income in America tax-free. And \$70,000 for married couples. Let's be clear about that. Let's be clear about what I said. With the money that is being saved by the War is Making You Poor Act, we can make \$35,000 of every American's income tax-free. And \$70,000 for married couples. And in addition to that, it takes the remaining money and reduces the Federal deficit and the Federal debt. I think those are three things, all of which need to be done. This bill brings them all together.

Let's start with the fact that the administration has asked for \$549 billion to basically keep the lights on at the Pentagon, and beyond that, asked for another \$159 billion for the wars. Let's see exactly how much that means. On this chart here, you can see that U.S. military spending is as much as the entire rest of the world combined. As much as the entire rest of the world combined. And in fact, the ones who come in second are NATO allies in Europe, who I don't expect to be attacking us any time soon. Beyond that, you have to go all the way down to China to get to any country that is conceivably ever going to be a military enemy. And we outspend China by over five to one. Beyond that, we get into our allies in East Asia and Australia, and you have to go all the way down to Russia, whom we outspend by almost ten to one, before you get to any country that could conceivably be a military opponent.

Why is this necessary? If we're going to have military spending that amounts to this much—half of all the military spending the world—do we need to have on top of that—on top of that base budget—another \$150 billion for the war? I think not, particularly when the people in America are suffering.

So I believe that the thing we need to do is to take that \$159 billion that the President has set aside. We're not saying he has to stop the war. We're not giving a cutoff date for the war. We're simply saying you need to fund that out of the base budget of \$549 billion. And we take 90 percent of that money and give it back to the American people.

I think most people would be surprised to learn that that is so much money that we have been spending on the war in Afghanistan and the war in Iraq that every single taxpayer in America will be able to get his first or her first \$35,000 of income completely tax-free. You won't see dollar one in tax until you make more than that. In fact, almost a third of Americans don't make more than that so they will simply be excused from the Federal income tax system. And all we need to do is to stop separately funding the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Now I've heard a lot of complaints from the other side and complaints from people on our side about the Federal debt and the Federal deficit. Here's something concrete that you can do. If this bill passes, we'll be able to reduce the Federal deficit by \$16 billion. You don't have to take my word for it. It's already been scored by the Joint Committee on Taxation. The Joint Committee on Taxation staff has determined that the tax cut that's needed to get every single person in America \$35,000 tax-free—their first \$35,000—would cost less than the wars and would leave over after that another \$16 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this is an idea whose time has come. It's time for the American people to see that there is no longer any need to go beyond the base, exorbitant defense budget that's presented to us by the President, notwithstanding the fact that there are wars in Afghanistan in Iraq. It's simply not necessary. You can see for yourself. Enough is enough. \$549 billion is plenty, particularly when we're using a Chinese credit card to pay for it all.

So I ask for your support, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Chamber will consider H.R. 5353, the War is Making You Poor Act.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DR. HAROLD A. CARTER, SR.—A LEGACY OF PRINCIPLE AND FAITH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a great American and true leader, Dr. Harold A. Carter, Sr., of Baltimore. His is a vision and a mission, grounded in the civil rights movement of the 1960s, that has compelling importance for our Nation today. More than half a century ago when Dr. Harold Carter, Sr., was still a young man in Selma, Alabama, Dr. Ralph Abernathy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., both offered Harold Carter his first opportunities to speak to their congregations as a newly ordained minister. "I was a young college student, and they wanted to give me a boost from the beginning," Dr. Carter observed in a 2005 article written by Mr. Sean Yoes of the Baltimore Afro-American newspaper. Mr. Speaker, it was a strong, inspiring, and enduring "boost," indeed. This same visionary foundation has inspired Dr. Carter throughout his ministry, both in the mission to proclaim the gospel to which he had been called and in the Social Gospel work of his faith. And I can say for a fact that not only does he preach the Word, but he lives it.

This year, Dr. Carter celebrates 45 years as the principal shepherd of Baltimore's New Shiloh Baptist Church. In his own words, he is, above all, "a God man," the primary trustee of his congregation's spiritual life. Yet at a time when our urban areas are in danger of crumbling under the stress of decades of disinvestment, Dr. Carter and his New Shiloh congregation also offer the people of Baltimore both hope and a concrete plan for social and economic renewal. A past leader of Baltimore's chapter of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and the local chapter of the Poor People's Campaign, Dr. Carter has readily acknowledged Dr. King's influence upon his vision for community renewal as an integral element of his New Shiloh ministry. "I learned from him that we have to take responsibility for our condition, whatever that might be," Dr. Carter once observed. "People in power do not concede anything to others freely, so we have to equip ourselves and do for ourselves based on the principles of unconditional love." That's Dr. Harold Carter, Sr.

Aided by the strength and talents of his wonderful wife, the late Dr. Weptanomah Carter, whom I also knew, his son and copastor, Dr. Harold A. Carter, Jr., and a dedicated con-

gregation that has grown to number in the thousands, New Shiloh is, indeed, equipping its community to move forward on empowering principles. Every day, people from the neighborhood can find inspiration and opportunity in its beautiful church and Family Life Center, its School of Music, Theological Center, Child Development Center and other facilities. These accomplishments of the congregation's Social Gospel mission are important aspects of Dr. Carter's vision, but they are far from the end. Already underway are plans for technical training for the community, a computer center, a senior center and senior housing.

Mr. Speaker, it is more appropriate under our constitutional system for me to leave it to others to commend Dr. Carter for the other wonderful ministers whom he has trained, including my own pastor, Bishop Walter Scott Thomas, Sr., and many, many others. Others are better qualified than I to attest to the lasting importance of Dr. Carter's spiritual writings, which have been many. However, I have been honored to serve as a spokesman for the Congressional Black Caucus to our Nation's faith communities, and in that duty, I have gained a thorough understanding of faith-based initiatives that are working. A part of what my teacher, my mentor and friend Dr. Harold Carter, Sr., has taught me is that the inspiration for faith-based programs that work cannot be found in a strategy to transfer public responsibility for greater social equity to the faith centers of our country. Rather, that motivating force must first arise from the hearts and minds of people of faith themselves.

This, I submit, is why Dr. Harold A. Carter, Sr., should stand as an example for all of our citizenry, whatever our respective faith traditions may be. This, I believe, is what Dr. Carter means when he speaks of how our local communities must undertake greater responsibility for themselves and their neighbors and how they must equip themselves for opportunity.

Unlike other megachurches that have left the inner cities of our Nation, New Shiloh Baptist Church has followed Dr. Carter's vision and his mission for his congregation. It has constructed its foundation on an unwavering commitment to the people of our great urban community.

RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT CALDERON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take strong exception to the speech by the President of Mexico here in this Chamber today. The Mexican Government has made it very clear for many years that it holds American sovereignty in contempt, and President Calderon's behavior as a guest of the

Congress today confirms and underscores this attitude. It is highly inappropriate for the President of Mexico to lecture Americans on American immigration law, just as it would be for Americans to lecture Mexico on its own laws. It is obvious that President Calderon does not understand the nature of America or the purpose of our immigration law. Unlike Mexico's immigration law, which is brutally exclusionary, the purpose of America's law is not to keep people out. It is to assure that as people come to the United States, they do so with the intention of becoming Americans and of raising their children as Americans. Unlike Mexico, our Nation embraces legal immigration, and what makes that possible is assimilation.

A century ago, President Teddy Roosevelt put it this way. He said, "In the first place, we should insist that if the immigrant who comes here in good faith becomes an American and assimilates himself to us, he shall be treated on an exact equality with everyone else, for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed, or birthplace, or origin. But this is predicated upon the person's becoming in every facet an American and nothing but an American. There can be no divided allegiance here. Any man who says he is an American, but something else also, isn't an American at all. We have room for but one flag, the American flag. We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language. And we have room for but one sole loyalty, and that is a loyalty to the American people." That is how we've created one great Nation from all the peoples of the world.

The largest group of immigrants now comes from Mexico. A recent RAND study found that during the 20th century, while our immigration laws were actually enforced, assimilation worked, and it made possible the swift attainment of the American Dream for millions of immigrants seeking to escape the conditions of Mexico. That is the broader meaning of our Nation's motto, "e pluribus unum"—from many people, one people, the American people. But there is now an element in our political structure that seeks to undermine that concept of e pluribus unum. It seeks to hyphenate Americans, to develop linguistic divisions, to assign rights and preferences based on race and ethnicity, and to elevate devotion to foreign ideologies and traditions while at the same time denigrating American culture, American values, and American founding principles. In order to do so, they know that they have to stop the process of assimilation. And in order to do that, they have to undermine our immigration laws. It is an outrage that a foreign head of state would appear in this Chamber and actively seek to do so. And it is a disgrace that he would be cheered on from the left wing of the White House and from many Democrats here in Congress.

Arizona has not adopted a new immigration law. All it has done is to enforce existing law that this President refuses to enforce. It's hardly a radical policy to suggest that if an officer on a routine traffic stop encounters a driver with no driver's license, no passport, and who doesn't speak English, that maybe that individual might be here illegally. And to those who say we must reform our immigration laws, I reply, We don't need to reform them. We need to enforce them, just as every other government does, just as Mexico does. Above all, this is a debate of, by, and for the American people. If President Calderon wishes to participate in that debate, I invite him to obey our immigration laws, apply for citizenship, do what 600,000 legal immigrants to our Nation are doing right now, learn our history and our customs, and become an American, and then he will have every right to participate in that debate. Until then, I would politely invite him to have the courtesy while a guest of this Congress to abide by the fundamental rules of diplomacy between civilized nations not to meddle in each other's domestic debates.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege and an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. I listened intently to the dialogue that took place before with Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California and Mr. POE of Texas. And as I sat back here and listened to the speech of President Calderon, I had some thoughts of my own that I wish to impart here into the record and for your attention, Mr. Speaker.

First I want to say that on the plus side of the speech that was delivered here to this joint session of Congress by President Calderon of Mexico, there were some up sides to it. He made some points that I think were constructive and needed to be said. One of the things that he said—and I am just going from my scratch notes—was that they are going to finally reestablish the rule of law in Mexico. Excuse me. To correct that, I want to make sure I'm accurate for the record, Mr. Speaker. I have the text of the speech here. It says, "firmly establish the rule of law in Mexico." That's an important point.

As I go to some of the worst places in the world, and I go there intentionally because I think to have that contrast, to understand where it's the toughest place in the world to operate, then it gives us that contrast to understand how well we're blessed here in America, and it helps us understand the functions of the institutions here in America and the functions of the culture and our values. Those pillars of American exceptionalism need to be understood

and polished and refurbished, and we need to do that on a daily basis here in this Congress instead of have them chiseled away at by the other side of the aisle.

But the contrast of how bad it might be, AIDS villages in southern Africa where there's not a single person there of reproductive age unless they're a missionary because the rest have died of AIDS. I go to Iraq, I go to Afghanistan, I go into those places in the world where poverty is a dominant force. Up into Tibet, for example. And most of those places that I go to—in fact, almost every place I go to, I can at least put together a formula on how to fix it, to be able to identify what's wrong and processes and procedures to put in place to put it on the right track. Most of us in this Congress believe we can at least gather the information to address these situations. When I come back from Mexico, I have this other sense. It's a different feeling. I can see a lot of the things that are wrong, but I don't know how to fix it, because the corruption goes so deep, it threads through so many components of their society. Unless there's a good formula to fix the culture of corruption, I don't know how you fix the rest of the institutions in Mexico.

I want to give a hats-off to President Calderon for taking on the drug cartels. I know, being down there in part of the exchange program, as he was a candidate for office shortly before he was elected, one of the things that I was advised, sitting in those meetings and sometimes it was one-on-one with the door closed, was that he is going to have to take on some of the forces that helped get him elected in order to straighten things out in Mexico. So when I see the numbers that show the thousands of casualties in the drug cartel wars that are going on and the federal officers that have been lost in that battle and the local police departments that are either afraid to enforce the law or are corrupt and wrapped up in the cartels, it's a very difficult task that he has faced.

I will give another point to the point that he has made that the consumption of illegal drugs here in the United States is one of the huge forces that drive the illegality that comes through Mexico. I have to concede that point. We need to address the illegal drug consumption in America. We lack the ability to do that. Our society, our culture, our civilization has accepted a certain level of illegal drug consumption and abuse in America. We've accepted the violence that goes with it. We've accepted the child abuse, the domestic problems that go along with it as simply a component of our society, as we accept the rotting inner cities in America, and we essentially send money there to start a new inner city economy that isn't based on something productive as a rule. Those are American problems that we need to address. He spoke to those lightly. He spoke to those gently. He referenced them. But

President Calderon came on very strong against the Arizona immigration law. And I'm wondering who briefed him before he gave his speech here today. It almost looks as though the speech was prepared by the Obama White House.

□ 1745

When you look at the language that was used and the language that he emphatically disagrees with Arizona's immigration law, SB 1070, that's the bill, he emphatically disagrees with the bill, even though he says that he recognizes our constitutional right to pass laws and establish immigration laws and enforce those immigration laws.

So I am wondering what it is that offends President Calderon so much about the Arizona immigration law since it mirrors the Federal immigration law. Was he offended then by the Federal immigration law? And when he sat down in the Oval Office with President Obama, did he say, I think you ought to amend the Federal immigration law so people here as legal immigrants don't have to carry their papers after the age of 18. That is the law. It has been the law for a long time. It is not something that offended people before. I hadn't heard about it before Arizona stepped forward and made it part of their State law.

So if President Calderon is offended and disagrees with Arizona immigration law, which mirrors Federal immigration law, if he hasn't voiced an objection to Federal immigration law, by the law of deductive reasoning, you would just boil it down to he is only offended because local law enforcement in Arizona will be enforcing the mirror of the Federal immigration law, because it can't be the law itself that he is offended by or he would also be offended by the Federal immigration law. I think that is a simple law of deductive reasoning to take it down to that. I am not sure that the people on the opposite side of the aisle from us have the capability to do that deductive reasoning any more.

And when I look at the people in the administration who have taken on Arizona's immigration law and willfully misinformed the American people, and I will include President Calderon of willfully misinforming the American people on the Arizona immigration law, but I look at the President of the United States who made comments that there could be a woman in Arizona taking her daughter off to get some ice cream and apparently because of the way they looked, they could be called over and asked to produce their papers.

Now that was playing the race card, and that divides the American people. And that recognizes a statement made by Mr. MCCLINTOCK a few minutes ago that there is an intentional effort to divide people for political purposes. The President has done it. And I can't imagine that he had read the bill until last night. He sounded a little more like he had, but he couldn't have read

it if he was going to say the things that he said.

He knows Arizona law doesn't allow for a woman or her daughter to be stopped for no other reason than their skin color when they are going off to get some ice cream. It specifically states that in the bill, not the ice cream part. But it specifically states there has to be probable cause; and in order to investigate the immigration status, there has to be a reasonable suspicion.

We understand reasonable suspicion. I happen to have written reasonable suspicion language in Iowa's workplace drug-testing law. We didn't ask a trained law enforcement officer to evaluate the reasonable suspicion. We simply asked an employer to either appoint himself or designate an employee to take 2 hours of course training in identifying reasonable suspicion. And then with that 2 hours of training and 1 hour per year refreshing training could be able to point to an individual and say I have a reasonable suspicion you are a drug abuser; you have to provide a urine sample. Here is the clinic. Here is the nurse. Go in there and we are going to test you.

For 12 years it has been in the law in Iowa, and I heard all of the same things when we passed that law. That reasonable suspicion would be used to discriminate against people because someone didn't like them because of their skin color, sexual orientation, gender identity, or whatever it might be. All of this hysteria that gets built up around this legislation and the willful misrepresentation of the language and the effect of the law turns out to be—what do we call it, a tempest in a teapot in the end, not something that is going to produce substance on the other side of this, but a lot of hysteria created.

As Tom Tancredo, who used to say these things on the floor of this House, he said the level of hysteria is proportional to the degree to which they are afraid the law will actually work and that Arizona will be able to enforce the mirror of Federal immigration law and they will be able to effectively outlaw sanctuary cities in Arizona. That is what this is about.

The people who object to Arizona immigration law are lying to the American people. Many of them know it. The Attorney General sat right here in that seat today and when President Calderon said that he objected to Arizona's immigration law, who led the standing ovation, the Attorney General of the United States who confessed to the gentleman from Texas that he didn't read the bill.

But he would commit the resources of the Justice Department to investigate Arizona for constitutionality questions, statutory questions, case law questions that had to do with Arizona's immigration law, not having read the bill, not having examined this or been even briefed by his own people, but having been directed by the Presi-

dent of the United States to use the full—well, use the force of the Justice Department to examine Arizona's immigration law and could not to me in that same hearing respond to a question, Could you point to a single place in the United States Constitution that causes you concern? Can you point to a single Federal statute that you think might preempt Arizona's immigration law? Can you point to a single piece of case law that would indicate that Arizona doesn't have the authority to enforce Federal immigration law.

He could do none of those things, and subsequently the gentleman from Texas asked him if he had read the bill. I thought when that question was asked that it was a question to set up something else because I thought it was a given that the Attorney General of the United States would have read the bill before he misrepresented it to the American people.

I yield to Judge POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. Regarding the Attorney General not reading the bill, he is a knowledgeable lawyer. Any knowledgeable lawyer who read the Arizona statute would know what he was saying was incorrect. That is why I asked him the question because I believed he hadn't read the law.

The law states in four places that racial profiling is prohibited under the statute. In four different places it says that. To make it very clear to everybody in Arizona and the world that will read the law, that racial profiling is prohibited under Arizona's new illegal immigration law that they have passed which, as you have said, is a mirror copy of U.S. immigration laws, and because the Federal Government does all kinds of things except protect the border, they are desperate in Arizona to protect their citizens; and, therefore, they passed that legislation.

I just wanted to mention, part of the problem with the Border Patrol in Arizona and other places along the Texas border, and why States like Arizona have decided they must enforce immigration laws is because of what is occurring.

Here is a chart of the assaults that have occurred against our Border Patrol agents. Border Patrol agents, as you know, the gentleman from Iowa, patrol the border within 25-30 miles of our southern border.

In the year 2004, there were about 380 assaults on our Border Patrol agents. I think that is a lot.

Then in 2005, there were 687.

In 2006, there were 752.

And then in the last 3 years, 2007, 2008 and 2009, there have been almost a thousand assaults on border agents. And those are folks that protect the dignity of the U.S. These assaults primarily come from people crossing the border illegally and they assault our Border Patrol agents who are just trying to protect the dignity and sovereignty of the United States. People are not supposed to come here unless they have permission. They are supposed to come here legally.

It has gotten so bad down at the border, they have improvised—and being in the construction business, Mr. KING, you would appreciate this—they call these Border Patrol vehicles “war wagons.” And the reason they call them war wagons is because these patrol right up next to the Texas-Mexico border and also the Arizona-Mexico border. And people crossing into the United States illegally pelt the Border Patrol with rocks, heavy rocks.

So they have put all of these meshed wire contraptions on their vehicles to protect the windows and protect themselves from bodily harm from the rock throwers who are arrogantly coming into the United States illegally. They see the Border Patrol, they start throwing rocks, and they come into the United States anyway.

So that is just one example of why the State of Arizona and other States are in dire straits. They want to protect the dignity and sovereignty of their State. They want to protect it from people coming in, from everybody, the good, the bad, and the ugly. And right now we are getting everybody, the good, the bad, and the ugly; a lot of bad and a lot of ugly.

It just seems to me that our government, rather than criticizing the State of Arizona, ought to be supporting Arizona, ought to enforce the rule of law on the border. If our government, the Federal Government, enforced the rule of law on the border, we wouldn't be having any of these discussions, but it doesn't. It is unfortunate that our Attorney General, and also the Secretary of Homeland Security, talked about this legislation and neither one of them before they made all of these statements about how bad the law was had read the legislation.

I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing that perspective in.

I have also spent time down on the border and ridden in the war wagons. I have seen the screen that hinged that goes over the windshield, and you can tip it back over the hood when you get away from the border and out of rock range.

I have watched them climb the fence, come into the United States, take a look and watch the Border Patrol move towards them, and they run at the speed they need to run to climb back over the fence, hang over the fence, and smile and wave and smirk. Sometimes the same individuals get caught, and they come to the Border Patrol station.

It is interesting to note that the Border Patrol in the Nogales area in particular, they will go out and pick people up, and they have a private contractor that comes and does the transport. They have paramilitary or military-type uniforms on these officers, gray uniforms, and they are riding in a white van. It has a cage built inside it. They will come along and pick them

up. When a Border Patrol officer picks them up, they will call the wagon and the contractor picks them up and delivers them to the station. And they walk in there. They already know the drill. They have their personal items in a Ziploc bag. They waltz in. Some have a smirk on their face. They know that the consequences are zero.

They will sit down along the wall. They know there is a little time while they take their turn to get fingerprinted and get their digital photograph. Then they will be sorted into cells and then loaded back on sometimes the same van, within an hour or so and taken back down to the port of entry on the border. They turn the van sideways, open the door, and they walk back into Mexico to come back again the next day or the next hour. We don't have catch and release any more the way we used to have it. We have now catch and return.

It occurs to me that we aren't really making progress. The mission statement down there on the border is not that we are going to get operational control of the border, even though Janet Napolitano seems to think that they are doing so because they have fewer interdictions, but I know you don't measure border crossings necessarily by how many people you stop coming in. You do it by how many people actually make the attempt and/or get through.

So to lower the law enforcement and interdict fewer people doesn't mean there are fewer attempts necessarily, but that is the metric that we are using.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana who has some comments on this issue.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I would like to state emphatically here this evening, Mr. Speaker, that I support the law of Arizona. Just as the gentleman said, it is really a mirror image of the United States law. I would say that those who are against the law who criticize it, some in our own government, do so for very interesting reasons. It is not really the law that they have such a problem with. It is the fact that we are enforcing a law that already exists. If that were not the case, then why, Mr. Speaker, do these people who are against this Arizona law, why don't they simply bring a bill to the floor and vote to repeal the existing American law. But that is not happening.

What we have had is a wink and a nod for many years, in which case we have a law on the books—I think it is a good law, it is not a perfect law—but a law that if we enforced it, we wouldn't have the problems that we have today. Let's just take a moment to understand why we have the problems that we have.

I lived in the San Diego, California, area some years ago, and it was very interesting. When you would leave San Diego and drive across the border into Tijuana, here we are, two cities that

are so close together that they abut one another, and yet on one side of the border you have beautiful homes, million dollar homes. You have wonderful bridges and infrastructure. And then as you cross the border, you find poverty. You find dirt roads. You find people in some cases living in the streets.

□ 1800

So there is such a chasm between the standard of living below the border than above that border, no wonder people try to cross the border for opportunity. I can't blame them for doing that.

But the problem is that it's a cultural and political problem that exists in Mexico today. And so rather than pointing his finger at us, President Calderon should, I think, address the problems in his country, and that is the fact that they have a high level of corruption, a high level of poverty.

I do agree with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) that he is doing a much better job about the drug cartels and enforcing those laws than any President in modern times from Mexico, so I definitely tip my hat to him for that.

But there is also no middle class in Mexico today. And like many third world countries, it's mostly a poverty-driven country, where many people are desperate for work and desperate for opportunities. But on the other hand, there is 10 percent or so of the population that lives a wealthy lifestyle. But there's very few opportunities for upward mobility.

And let's just finally look at it. We're all descendants of immigrants at one point or another, and our ancestors came here because they were looking for opportunity. And we have many people around the world who come here looking for opportunity, and we have a way for them to do that.

I think it was the gentleman from California earlier that mentioned that 600-something thousand legal immigrants came to this country last year. So we have a way of doing that, although we, I think, could make it better. We could make it more efficient. But the truth is there is a legal way to immigrate to the United States, and we should make that available, and we do make that available.

On the other hand—and I welcome those immigrants. But on the other hand, those who come across our borders illegally, inappropriately, and who, in many ways, create danger for our own citizens, create problems for our own economy in terms of the need for education for their children and for health care, doing that illegally is not a solution to the problem. It may be a short-term solution for their immediate economic problems, but Mexico has got to address its own economic and cultural problems. And we, on the other hand, have got to take care of our borders, our sovereignty here.

And so, again, I would just reiterate that I do support Arizona's bold move,

I think a necessary move, to protect their borders, to protect their economy. I believe it's Phoenix that is considered the kidnapping capital of at least the United States, if not the world. And who can blame the people of Arizona for doing for themselves what the Federal Government refuses to do, even though it has an obligation to do that?

And then, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) points out, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) as well, we have the Attorney General sitting here today right in front of this body and having already admitted, confessed that he didn't read the law to begin with; and, after all, it's essentially the same law that he's agreed to uphold and defend as Attorney General, and somehow agreeing with the President from another country who says we should turn a blind eye to the illegal immigrants who are coming across the border.

So I would just say that I agree with the two gentlemen here tonight. It's time something is done. And I agree with the efforts of Arizona, and I do think other States are going to take this up as well and come up with similar laws.

And I think we here in the body of the U.S. Congress should also move forward with immigration reform, but not in the form of amnesty that we hear about from the other side, but a true reform where we can more efficiently allow people to come across the border to work here temporarily if there are jobs for them in a legal way, but make sure that they return when they're done; and, on the other hand, those who are here illegally return and never come back in an illegal status.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

A number of things come to mind as I listened to the dialog here. One of them was lurking in the back of my mind that I had to go back and find. It was a statement that was made by President Calderon that I'd like to have a sit-down conversation with him on, when he said in the early part of his speech today, he said, As you can see, Mexico was founded on the same values and principles as the United States of America. I don't think I can see that. I'd like to know what he's thinking about and talking about when he makes that statement. There are certainly principles that are similar and principles that are identical, but there are principles on the way the United States was founded that are unique to the United States of America. And that's a conversation for another time.

I pose that question out there, and if anybody has an answer to that, I'm not illuminated enough on that subject matter to see into his mind to understand what he's actually saying so that I can agree with him. No, I disagree with him until I can find a better explanation.

When the gentleman earlier, Mr. McCLINTOCK, talked about 600,000 legals, he must have been referring to 600,000 naturalizations a year in America. And when I look at the numbers of people that come into the United States legally, under a visa, we're up now to about 1.5 million in the last 2 or 3 years. That number over the last 10 years averages about 1 million a year. There is no nation in the world that is as generous with its legal immigration as the United States of America is, and there is no nation in the world that we're more generous to with legal immigration than the nation of Mexico. Those are simply facts.

We saw some facts, I think, today that showed about 111,000 legal immigrants from Mexico on an annual basis. And I remember seeing some data that showed about 14½ percent of the legal immigrants into the United States come from Mexico. Those numbers would comport pretty closely to each other. That's pretty generous.

And we saw also, our economy, we've had an increase in the numbers of unemployment, up to 470,000 new applications for unemployment. It was interesting that President Calderon talked about their economy creating 400,000 new jobs in the last quarter in Mexico, and here we're watching 470,000 new applicants for unemployment in the United States of America. And if I go back to the workforce in the United States 10 years ago, the workforce was 142 million, and today it's a little over 153 million in the workforce. And if you would add up the legal immigrants that have received green cards and processed through this process of, some to naturalization, some not to naturalization, about half that come to the United States legally actually follow through on the citizenship application component. But the legal immigration over the last 10 years and the jobs that have been opened up for people that came here that received green cards or workers' visas almost mirrors the size of the growth in our workforce.

And so we have 15.4 million unemployed in America. We have another 5 to 6 million that are looking for jobs. Around 20 million or more in America would meet my definition of unemployment, people that need work and are looking for it. We have a workforce that could be expanded dramatically if we would simply take those of working age who are not engaged in the workforce, that aren't working for one reason or another. That's about 80 million.

So we have 20 million looking for work in America, unemployed, and those that have given up trying to look, and then you add another 60 million that are simply not in the workforce for one reason or another that are of working age. That's 80 million Americans we can draw from. And we have 8 million illegals in America, at least, that are going to work on a regular basis.

Now, enforcing immigration law would open up 8 million jobs. That

would be half of the unemployment problem, roughly that 15.4 million that are technically unemployed. About half of those could go to work to fill the slots of those that are now being occupied by illegals.

And when people say that there's work that Americans won't do, there's not a single job they can point to that they can't say an American won't do. And about 3 years ago, I looked into that when President Bush was making that statement constantly, there's work that Americans won't do and so we have to bring in immigrants, and the illegal ones are the ones that first come and he wants to legalize them.

So I asked the question: What is the toughest, dirtiest, most dangerous, most difficult job there is that any American would be asked to do? And the answer to that, as I polled the people around me, came back, well, rooting terrorists out of places like Fallujah would be about the toughest job there is.

And so, well, what do you pay the lowest ranking marine to go into Fallujah and put his life on the line to root the terrorist out of there?

Well, if you paid him a 40-hour week instead, and it's 60 or 70 hours a week or more, but a 40-hour week, that comes to about \$8.09 an hour. So if a marine will go in and root terrorists out of Fallujah, for his country, granted, at \$8.09 an hour, I don't think you can find a job picking lettuce that an American won't do for the going rate.

And what's happened is our economy has gotten so distorted, we've become such a welfare state that, according to Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, a study that he did a couple of years ago, if you would take a typical family of four that was headed by a high school dropout, without regard to their immigration status, legal or illegal, American, natural born, naturalized, but a high school dropout heading a household, a typical family of four, the net draw—well, first I have to say, they pay taxes. They pay about an average of \$9,000 in taxes. But they'll draw down an average of \$32,000 in benefits, and the net cost to the taxpayer is \$22,449 a year. That's \$1.5 million over the 50-year span of heading that household.

And so now America's become a welfare state. And the lower skilled people, natural born, naturalized, legal or illegal, can't sustain their household in this economy because their skill level isn't high enough. And we would argue, we need more unskilled people in America so we can pay more people not to work and subsidize more families because the pressure on those jobs at the lower skills is so high that the highest percentages of unemployment in America are exactly in the lowest skilled jobs that we have.

I would say we need a tighter labor market so the wages and benefits can come up in the lower skilled workers so they can sustain themselves. And those other folks, the taxpayers don't have

to subsidize that household and the households of the people that aren't working at all. That's one of those economic equations.

Mr. FLEMING. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. The gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I'd just like to expand on that point real quickly, and that is that we're moving rapidly in this country towards paying people not to work. So, obviously, that creates that vacuum that you're talking about where people from Mexico want to come across the border illegally to find jobs.

But what's very interesting about President Calderon is, as I understand it, that the rules for immigration into Mexico from its southern border are far more onerous than our own laws. In fact, ours are much more generous, and yet he's again criticizing us. That really makes no sense. It doesn't add up. It's hypocritical, of course.

So I think you're absolutely right, Mr. KING, because not only should we make sure that the opportunities are there for our own citizens, but we should take away, I think, any incentives for people not to work when, in fact, they're fully able bodied to do so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I'd just make this point, and that would be that when we have people that are being subsidized, their families are being subsidized because they can't make enough wages to sustain their household, and, for example, working in the packing plant in my neighborhood 20 years ago paid about the same amount that a teacher makes today. It paid about the same amount as a teacher 20 years ago, but today a teacher makes about twice as much as the person that works in the packing plant. The person that works in the packing plant now has trouble sustaining themselves without some kind of support.

There was a day when a young person growing up in my neighborhood, if they wanted to, they could go get a job in the packing plant and they could buy a modest house and pay for the home and prepare for retirement and send their kids off to college. There'd be some student loans in that, and significant ones, but they could manage their life and they could go to work and, with respect in the community, be able to sustain their family. Today, that's been driven out because of an oversupply of cheap labor.

I'd yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A couple of points. One thing that President Calderon said today that I totally agree with is that the rule of law is important. He said he believed in the rule of law. So do I. But I think the rule of law ought to be enforced not only in Mexico, but ought to be enforced in the United States.

And as the gentleman from Iowa has mentioned, the United States is the

most generous country on Earth when it comes to legal immigration. It is a policy of this country to allow people to come here. And if you travel around the world, everybody wants to come to the United States, and that's a good thing. And they want to come for a lot of reasons. As the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) says, opportunity is one of those reasons. But they want to come also for other reasons, including the word "liberty" that we don't talk about too much.

But, in any event, we allow people to come here the right way. And when people come here the right way, they appreciate being here, especially those who have gone through that long process of becoming citizens. They make fine American citizens because they are Americans after they take that oath to uphold the Constitution.

□ 1815

But the rule of law should also apply in the areas where people want to come here illegally. People who cross our borders illegally disrespect the rule of law. They disrespect our rule of law. They should come here the right way. They should get in line the right way. And they should not disrespect not only Americans, but those who do it the right way.

You know, one of the things we do in our office, as both of you do in your offices, we help people come to the United States legally. We probably do more case work on immigration issues than everything else put together except maybe veterans and military issues. We help people come here all the time. We get those calls, and people want to come to the United States to visit, to work, to be a tourist, to go to school, or to become citizens. And we do everything we can to help those people come the right way.

I too, like I think most Members of the House, are for legal immigration. But people should not sidestep that process and ignore the rule of law, as President Calderon says he is for the rule of law, and come around that process and just come in the United States any way they can and then take the benefits of being in the United States without being here legally.

So I think when it comes to legislation, we hear about comprehensive immigration reform. What that means is, really that's disguise for the word amnesty. I think what we ought to start doing right now is before we start with more legislation, why don't we just enforce the laws we already have? We have plenty of laws already that talk about the rule of law and securing the border and making sure people don't come in here. We just don't enforce those laws. I think those laws are not enforced for political reasons. That's my opinion.

But I will yield back to the gentleman from Iowa because I can tell you want to say something.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time from the gentleman from Texas,

actually I was looking to see if I could come up with within the text of President Calderon's speech, it seems to me that I heard him say, and it wasn't clear enough in my memory, that our immigration laws were broken or needed to be repaired. And I want to find the exact text of that. And I will do that.

But I wanted to add to the dialogue here on amnesty. Because amnesty has been the central word in the immigration debate from the beginning of immigration debate, and we go back to 1986, when President Reagan signed the amnesty bill. And even though I disagreed with that act, it was one of the very few times that President Reagan let me down, but he was in a position where he believed he had to sign the bill. And the bargain was if we would grant amnesty to a million people that were in the United States illegally, then they would turn up the enforcement of immigration law, and there would never be another amnesty again. And that's been, well, 1986. So 24 years ago when he signed that bill he was at least straight up and honest about it and said it's amnesty.

Now, we understood what amnesty was in 1986, but I watched them try to change the meaning and the definition of the word amnesty throughout this debate going back to President Bush's immigration speech that he gave in about January of 2005. And throughout all of that I heard them argue, many people from that administration, and then the concept was pushed forward from the Obama administration that it's not amnesty if you make them pay a fine, learn English, and pay back taxes.

Well, what is it that you wouldn't require of an American citizen? Learning English is something we would require of someone that would want to be naturalized. So that's not an extra burden to give somebody a path to citizenship to require them to learn English. That's already law. You have to demonstrate proficiency in both the spoken and the written English language. So paying your back taxes? We wouldn't accept somebody as a naturalized citizen that had back taxes that they didn't pay. That's an obligation to pay your taxes.

So the only other thing, the thing that makes it not amnesty in the minds of the people that argue that it's not amnesty to give somebody amnesty, is to require them to pay a fine. So the fine started out at \$500. And I pointed out that a coyote's average price is \$1,500. Could you at least get it up there to where if they can pay a coyote \$1,500 to bring them into the United States, to smuggle them in, couldn't they at least match the pot to become a citizen of the United States? Well, then they raised the ante to \$1,500. Now they said it's not amnesty, surely, because now it's the going rate for citizenship.

You can't sell citizenship to America. You cannot do that. Citizenship is pre-

cious, it's sacred. It's something that when you go and speak at a naturalization service, and I have done that on a number of occasions, and I presume my colleagues have done that as well, it's a very, very rewarding thing to do. I recall one in particular in the Old Executive Office Building right across from the White House itself, in the Indian Room. This was presided over by the Secretary of Citizenship Immigration Services, USCIS, Emilio Gonzalez at the time, who happens to also be an immigrant from Cuba. And he understands this in perspective.

And as he gave the speech to the several score that received their naturalization that day. He said, When they ask you where are you from, you tell them, "I am from America." From this day forward, you tell them, "I am from America." Tell them you are the first American. Don't answer you are from anywhere else; you are an American. You are the first American, you are the first generation of Americans in the lineage that will follow from you. And when you look out that window and you think of the person that lives in that House next door, the President of the United States—he didn't say President, but that's the scenario that we were in—to remember, from this day forward you are as much an American as he is.

I have never heard it so eloquently put how much we embrace the naturalized American citizen that comes through and follows through the right way. And when we embrace American citizenship, we also embrace the Declaration, the Constitution, our history, the rule of law, the experiences that bind us together. And we should understand that words mean things, and you can't redefine them because they are inconvenient. And the word amnesty, to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime.

Now, if their objective is citizenship and you grant them a path to that, and they broke the law and you give them a path to citizenship, that's a reward. If the objective is they want to work in the United States, and you tell them you can do so and we are going to leave you alone now, then you have rewarded them with the objective of their crime. If they falsified their identity, stolen someone's identity, and you waive that identity theft that steals from someone else their security, their credit rating, their confidence that they can be secure in their person and you waive that because you would give them a path to citizenship, that's amnesty. Time after time again rewarding people with the objective of their crime.

They might have come here just to deal in drugs. Well, so are we going to let them falsify their identification documents and become part of the—last time it was two-thirds of those who came in under the amnesty plan falsified their records. There was that much corruption. About a million that were designed to receive the amnesty,

and then the fraud and corruption expanded that to about 3 million all together in the 1986 amnesty act that rewarded them for violation of their crimes.

And when I ask the illegal immigrants that come into the United States, We want to do a background check on you, how do we do that? Can you get me your birth certificate? We want to track and see if you have any violations in your old country. And their answer would be, well, yeah, I can get a birth certificate. Well, then why don't you get me one? Well, first, what do you want it to say? What do you want this birth certificate to say? Why do you ask me such a thing? Well, I want to make sure I get you a birth certificate that says what you need it to say. How old do I need to be? Where do I need to be born? Can I have a clean record?

And so you can't trust the data that comes from a country that only half the people are born in hospitals, and the ones that aren't don't have birth certificates as a rule. And so there are many myopic things going on in this country.

You have people over on this side of the aisle that are completely pandering for political power. And some will argue that Republicans want cheap labor and Democrats want all the political power that comes with that. I will argue there are a lot of Democrats in business that think they have a birth-right to cheap labor. And it isn't even a majority I don't think any longer of Republicans that take that position.

Sometimes they just simply have to compete because the people that they are competing against are hiring a lot of cheap labor. Then they rationalize and they decide I will hire some of this cheap labor, too. And pretty soon it becomes a virus that just takes over the economy, and the rule of law is the victim.

But I would like to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank you for yielding.

To expand on that point, I have spoken to a number of business owners who have said just that. They really do not want to hire illegals but feel compelled to because the only way they can compete is to do the very same thing that their competitors are doing as well. So even those who wish not to be corrupt and wish not to break the laws are forced either out of business or forced to violate those laws that we should be enforcing in the first place.

But the other thing, just to touch on amnesty again, it seems like we have gone through this cycle twice before. And the first thing that we do towards a solution has been to generate amnesty. And where has it gotten us? We have more illegals in this country and more problems with illegals than we have ever had before. So if starting with amnesty with or without a fine was a solution to the problem, the problem would be solved already. So

obviously amnesty is not the answer. So I oppose amnesty.

I support the enforcement of the laws on the book, both Federal and the Arizona State laws, and perhaps other States that will take up those laws.

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I support is that English should be our national language. It's really I think insulting when you are in your own country and you have to sort through all sorts of phone messages to just get to the right language you should be in. If someone is serious enough about coming to this country and staying or working here, then I think they should at least make the effort to learn our language, at least the basics of our language. And rather than citizens being forced to in effect learn other people's languages just because they are coming here illegally, or in some cases legally.

So those are I think three solid requirements that we should have: That we should have English as our official national language; that we should not grant amnesty under any sort of reform bill; and that we enforce the laws that exist on the book today.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana as I reclaim.

I certainly agree. And I would add to this that it is one of my very solidly held beliefs, and if you look across history and the forces of culture and civilization, that the single most powerful unifying force for humanity known throughout all of history is a common language. When you look, the most successful institutions over the last 200 years have been the nation states. And the borders of nation states have been shaped around the lines where people speak a common language.

Why is France France? Because they speak French there. Why is Germany the reunified Germany? Because they speak German there. In Switzerland it's a little bit different. But that's a lot longer story. And they have actually not had a lot of agreement there for the last 700 years until after World War II. But it's a powerful unifying force.

And if you look back 2,500 years ago in China, there was an emperor there. He was the first emperor of China. And I can never pronounce this in Chinese, so somebody out there is going to cringe. I can probably spell it, but it's close to Qin Shi Huang, the first emperor of China. It was actually about 245 B.C. when he lived.

And he looked at that vast area of China, and there were 300-some different dialects and languages that were spoken. They had all of those separate provinces. They were not unified. But as he traveled around, he looked and he realized these are similar people. They look the same. They don't speak the same language. They wear similar clothes, they eat similar food, they are of a similar ethnic background just by looks. And he decided he wanted to unify the Chinese people for the next 10,000 years.

So he hired some scribes to produce a language that could unify them. And that's where all of these 5,000 characters in the commonly used Chinese written language that are common to all the Chinese, or up to 50,000 different varieties of all these 5,000 characters, came from. That's why it's picture writing. The intelligent people that he hired were intellectuals. They sat down and decided, well, we don't know how to make this make sense unless we draw a picture. So they did these pictures. Now we have the Chinese language. And the goal to unify the Chinese people for the next 10,000 years has been pretty effective. He is a fourth of the way along the way.

He is also the one who standardized the width of the axles on the oxcarts so they could fit in or out of the ruts. And he standardized a number of things. The terra-cotta guards are another component of that. But it's a piece of wisdom that has been holding together for a quarter of a millennia. And it's a piece of wisdom that we can't seem to get figured out here in the United States of America. It's the only country in the world that doesn't have an official language. That's my research. Some others will disagree with that. But that's, again, a longer story.

□ 1830

But I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas to add to this wisdom, as we have about 12 minutes left on the clock.

Mr. POE of Texas. I agree to the comment that we all should speak the same language. Now, being from Iowa, you would probably think those of us in Texas and Louisiana don't speak the same language you do even though it is a version of English, they tell us.

I'd like to make one more comment about how difficult it is to live on the border.

Everybody in this House needs to go down to the southern border and just travel the border and just observe what's taking place. The border, as a local Texas Ranger tells me, he says after dark, the border gets western. And what he means by that is it gets violent on both sides. Good people in Mexico and in the United States live in fear if they live close to the border, primarily the drug cartels. But it's also the international gangs that operate freely back and forth across the border.

And the brunt of that, of course, occurs in the border counties, all the way from Brownville, Texas, to San Diego, California. So there are 14 counties in Texas that are close to the border or border the northern border of Mexico. And periodically I will call the Texas sheriffs and I ask them this question. Pick the same day every month, and I call them and say, How many people are in your jail today that are foreign nationals? Don't distinguish between legal or illegal or where they're from. But how many are foreign nationals?

So the most recent call that I made—called all 14 sheriffs on the same day—

and they told me how many people, percentage-wise, were in their jail. It goes all the way from Terrell County, where a hundred percent of the people in the jail are foreign nationals. True, small county, small jail. But the average across all of the southern counties in Texas on the day certain about 3 weeks ago, 4 weeks ago, was 37 percent. Thirty-seven percent of the people, Texas border county jails, are foreign nationals. Now, that's expensive to take care of these people.

Now, these aren't people charged with immigration violations. These are people charged with felonies and misdemeanors committed in the United States. These are poor counties. They can't afford to prosecute these folks.

And so that is just one of the problems that occurs in the southern portion of the United States when the Federal Government does not enforce the rule of law on the border. Secure the border so that people come here with permission or they don't come. And that includes folks who come over here—not all, by any means—but those who come over here illegally to commit crimes.

And because the border is porous, many of these people in the county jails down there, when they make bond, they head back south, commit crimes back and forth across the border on both sides of the border. If they commit a crime in Mexico, they hide in the United States. If they commit a crime in the United States, they run back to Mexico.

So this, I think, is a phenomenal statistic. Thirty-seven percent of the people, border county jails, on this one day were foreign nationals.

So I think the obligation of the Federal Government is to quit talking about this, get rid of the politics, and do what governments are supposed to do: protect the people, especially the people of the United States, not just the ones on the border but all of the people in the United States from those who wish to come over here illegally, primarily the criminal gangs and drug cartels.

With that, I'll yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the judge from Texas as I reclaim.

I came across the language that I said I would look for in President Calderon's speech where he said, I fully respect the right of any country to enact and enforce its own laws, but what we need today is to fix a broken system.

I would argue that, yes, there's a lot of burden on the system, but I am not seeing the Department of Justice come to us and ask for more money for judges, more money for prosecutors. We also heard in our dialogue today that they are bringing charges and prosecuting if someone has 500 or more pounds of marijuana they are smuggling into the United States.

I have personally pulled out of the false bed of a pickup about 240 pounds

of marijuana. That wasn't enough to get him prosecuted when the threshold was 250.

It's astonishing for me to think how much is 500 pounds of marijuana and how you might let somebody go and not prosecute. No wonder there's not a restraint there if we're not willing to put these resources in.

And I'm not getting a number when I ask how much money are we spending on the southern border to defend that border. I want to know how much a mile. I can't get that answer back from Janet Napolitano because the budget is broken up in different categories and they mix and match and slide it around.

We put this together and we've just tracked now the increases. But about 3 years ago, the numbers turned out to be \$8 billion on our southern border. Now it's increased by an additional 50 percent. So one has to presume that 8 and 4 is 12—\$12 billion on our southern border. Instead of it being \$4 million a mile, now it's \$6 million a mile. \$12 billion.

With all of that money that's being spent with boots on the ground, and we're doing a catch-and-return and we're not able to prosecute in some of these sectors of the border unless they have 500 or more pounds of marijuana with them, how can we expect that that is a deterrent or that it is effective? I don't know that the system is broken, but neither can I see that we're using the laws that we have and enforcing them to their fullest effect. And neither can I see that there's a mission understanding on the border that is articulated from the White House on down to the Border Patrol agents who punch the clock, go in and do their job. And some of them do a great job. But it's a difficult thing to do if there's not an overall mission understanding.

We've got about 5 minutes, and I'd yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman. I won't need much time to close out my remarks, and that is that, again, the Federal Government has failed to do its job. It's failed to protect its citizens, it's failed to protect its borders, it's failed to protect its sovereignty. And we have a State, the State of Arizona, which has stepped up, very carefully crafted a law that mirrors that of the Federal Government that's not being enforced. They've stepped up to the plate and said this is costing us in terms of human lives, really. And in terms of other costs, financial and otherwise, we're better off to step forward and do something about this even though the Federal Government refuses to send troops or whatever protection we need to have.

So I think that that is the beauty of this Republic, and that is that each State has its own government and becomes a test tube for the entire Nation. It's going to be very interesting going forward to see what the results of this in Arizona are, and I think the results are going to be very good. And I think

very soon we're going to see other States replicating this, and it will force the hand of the Federal Government to finally step up and do the right thing.

And with that, I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I briefly reclaim and make the point also that the ACLU and a number of other left-wing organizations have filed a lawsuit against Arizona's immigration law, and they intend to press that in the courts. So if they're worried about discrimination taking place, I don't know why they're out there beating the drum.

We've got other organizations out there that have announced, as of today, that they're going to continue and accelerate civil disobedience against Arizona's immigration law.

And on top of that you have some of the cities in the country that are boycotting Arizona. You saw the basketball players that weren't able to go down to Arizona even though they'd earned their place in the tournament because apparently the school administration wants to make a political statement.

All of these huge mistakes that are made to pit Americans against Americans. And we should stand together and stand behind and stand with the rule of law, which is represented so well by the judge of Texas, who I'd offer a final word to.

Mr. POE of Texas. Thank you, gentlemen, for yielding briefly.

I want to comment about our border protectors.

The Border Patrol, the sheriffs all along the border do everything they can to secure the sovereignty to protect us from those who come into the United States illegally. The Border Patrol has asked, and we have asked—myself and others—have asked the President to grant the request of the Texas Governor to send the National Guard to the border. We need more boots on the ground. The National Guard can do that. The President has not answered that request, a yes or no or we're looking at your letter.

So I would hope that the National Guard could work together with the Border Patrol, the sheriffs, secure the border. Let's mean it when we say we want border security and protect the people of the United States.

I'll yield back the remaining time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming and thanking the gentlemen from Texas and Louisiana for being here tonight to add so much to this dialogue that we had.

We're a Nation. We can't call ourselves a Nation if we can't define ourselves by borders; and the border must be defended, and we must protect it, and we must control who goes in and who goes out.

The Constitution has a couple of places where it addresses immigration. I'd point that out if the Attorney General were still sitting in this seat here that we're required, the Federal Government, is required to protect us from

invasion. That's one of the components. And then in article 1, section 8, it says that Congress should establish a uniform naturalization law. Well, we have done that for a uniform naturalization. That means whatever nation you come from, you go through the same tests and meet the same standards and there won't be different criteria from one State to another, so that people can become Americans under a standardized formula.

But it doesn't say anywhere in the Constitution that the States cannot support Federal immigration law.

And I add that there was a lot of misinformation that was presented around this country, and it continues to be presented around this country that argues that local law enforcement doesn't have authority enough to enforce immigration law. And it's never been true in this country. It's been something that's a fabrication, but it's never been true. The case of *U.S. v. Santana Garcia*, 2001 establishes the implicit authority of local government to enforce Federal immigration law.

I appreciate the attendance and the dialogue and the contribution of my friends from Louisiana and Texas and the job they do in this Congress.

I appreciate your attention, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of bereavement leave.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. AL GREEN of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, May 27.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, May 27.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 920. An act to amend section 11317 of title 40, United States Code, to improve the transparency of the status of information technology investments, to require greater accountability for cost overruns on Federal information technology investment projects, to improve the processes agencies implement to manage information technology investments, to reward excellence in information technology acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in addition to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 21, 2010, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 111th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

MARK S. CRITZ, Pennsylvania, Twelfth.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-Authorized Official Travel during the first quarter of 2010 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Lale Mamaux	1/04	1/06	Turkey		344.00		7,220.40				7,564.40
	1/06	1/08	Syria		308.00						308.00
	1/08	1/11	Egypt		419.00						419.00
	1/11	1/12	Jordan		542.82						542.82
	1/12	1/14	Israel		364.00						364.00
	1/14	1/18	Ukraine		1,664.00						1,664.00
Hon. Lincoln Diaz-Balart	3/11	3/14	Lithuania		577.91		6,230.27		729.55		7,537.73
Muftiah McCartin	1/14	1/18	Ukraine		646.00				960.00		1,606.00
Brad Smith	1/22	1/28	Republic of Georgia		1,940.00		10,794.00		1,223.00		13,957.00
Committee totals					6,805.73		24,244.67		2,912.55		33,962.95

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER, Chairman, May 5, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Edward J. Markey	1/28	1/31	Switzerland		1,700.28		1,115.50				1,815.78

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	3/28	3/31	Switzerland		612.00		9,024.40				9,636.40
Barton Forsyth	3/28	3/31	Switzerland		612.00		7,138.60				7,750.60
Thomas SchreibeI	3/28	3/31	Switzerland		612.00		9,024.40				9,636.40
Committee totals					3,536.28		25,302.90				28,839.18

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SARAH E. BUTLER.

(AMENDED) REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND GLOBAL WARMING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Barton Forsyth	3/28	3/30	Switzerland		408.00		7,138.60				7,546.60
Committee totals											28,635.60

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

SARAH E. BUTLER, May 12, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2010

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN, May 4, 2010.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7560. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Florida Avocado Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AC22) received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7561. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations, Basic Provisions; and Various Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AB96) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7562. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — a-(p-Nonylphenol)-w-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene) Sulfate and Phosphate Esters; Time-Limited Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0892; FRL-8826-3] received May 14, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7563. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — a-[p-(1,1,3,3-Tetramethylbutyl)phenyl]-w-hydroxypoly(oxyethylene); Time-Limited Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0890; FRL-8824-3] received May 14, 2010, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7564. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Prevention of Salmonella Enteritidis in Shell Eggs During Production, Storage, and Transportation; Change of Registration Date, Address, and Telephone Number; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2000-N-0190] received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7565. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California; Legal Authority [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0269; FRL-9152-6] received May 14, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7566. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0517; FRL-9152-8] (RIN: 2060-AP86) received May 14, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7567. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7568. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Fed-

eral Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7569. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7570. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7571. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7572. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7573. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7574. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7575. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7576. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7577. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7578. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7579. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7580. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7581. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7582. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7583. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7584. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7585. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7586. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7587. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7588. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7589. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7590. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7591. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7592. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7593. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7594. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7595. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7596. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7597. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7598. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7599. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7600. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7601. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan [Docket No.: 100119028-0123-02] (RIN: 0648-AY31) received April 26, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7602. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV45) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7603. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administra-

tion, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XU72) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7604. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less than 60 feet (18.3m) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV54) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7605. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Modification of the Yellowtail Flounder Landing Limit for the U.S./Canada Management Area [Docket No.: 080521698-9067-02] (RIN: 0648-XV49) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7606. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV61) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7607. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910131362-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV32) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7608. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollack in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 0910091344-9056-02] (RIN: 0648-XU73) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7609. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV52) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7610. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Removal of Gear Restriction for the U.S./Canada Management Area [Docket No.: 080521698-9067-02] (RIN: 0648-XU84) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7611. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0810141351-9087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV21) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7612. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod for American Fisheries Act Catcher Processors Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 0910131363-0087-02] (RIN: 0648-XV66) received April 27, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 1017. A bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care and services; with an amendment (Rept. 111-488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 5145. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the continuing professional education reimbursement provided to health professionals employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs (Rept. 111-489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FILNER: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3885. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy (Rept. 111-490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

[Corrected from the Record of May 18, 2010]

Under clause 2 of rule XII, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 4842. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal years 2011 and 2012, and for other purposes; with an amendment, Rept. 111-486, Part 1; referred to the Committee on Science and Technology for a period ending not later than June 18, 2010, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(o), rule X.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 5347. A bill to prevent and end the occurrence of sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PENCE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. AKIN, Ms. FALLIN, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia):

H.R. 5348. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reduce the number of civil service positions within the executive branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 5349. A bill to provide that Cambodia's debt to the United States may not be reduced or forgiven, and textile and apparel articles that are the product of Cambodia and imported into the United States may not be extended duty free treatment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 5350. A bill to continue restrictions against and prohibit diplomatic recognition of the Government of North Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. McKEON, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 5351. A bill to safeguard the sovereignty and right to self-defense of the United States and its allies, to prohibit United States participation in the International Criminal Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5352. A bill to require hydroelectric energy generated in Alaska to be considered as renewable energy for purposes of Federal programs and standards; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON (for himself, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 5353. A bill to reduce the \$159.3 billion from the discretionary overseas contingency operations funds in the President's fiscal year 2011 budget for operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan (without preventing use of mandatory funds from the Department of Defense budget to execute the War on Terror), and amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide individuals a "War is Making You Poor" tax credit against the savings attributable to the overseas contingency operations reduction; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 5354. A bill to establish an Advisory Committee on Gestational Diabetes, to provide grants to better understand and reduce gestational diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 5355. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to repeal the limitation of liability of a responsible party for a discharge or substantial threat of a discharge of oil from an offshore oil facility; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. BONNER):

H.R. 5356. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to increase the cap on liability for economic damages resulting from an oil spill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 5357. A bill to provide for the deployment of additional National Guard troops along the international border between the United States and Mexico in support of the border control activities of the United States Customs and Border Protection of the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 5358. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to prohibit oil and gas preleasing, leasing, and related activities in certain areas of the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. CAO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. WATSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 5359. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 5360. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the standard of visual acuity required for eligibility for specially adapted housing assistance provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. MEEKS of New York):

H.R. 5361. A bill to amend section 1333 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 to ensure that multifamily housing mortgage purchases by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that are credited toward fulfillment of such enterprises multifamily special affordable housing goal increase or preserve the number

of dwelling units affordable to low-income families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SALAZAR:

H.R. 5362. A bill to provide for the release of water from the marketable yield pool of water stored in the Ruedi Reservoir for the benefit of endangered fish habitat in the Colorado River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KRATOVIL, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MINNICK, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NYE, Mr. ROSS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio):

H.R. 5363. A bill to make funds available to increase program integrity efforts and reduce wasteful government spending of taxpayer's dollars; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 5364. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide oral health services to aged, blind, or disabled individuals under the Medicaid Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 5365. A bill to limit the relief available to persons who have been unconstitutionally prohibited from protesting at military and other funerals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 5366. A bill to require the proposal for debarment from contracting with the Federal Government of persons violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.J. Res. 85. A joint resolution expressing the disfavor of the Congress regarding the proposed agreement for cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina:

H. Res. 1380. A resolution applauding the State of Arizona for asserting its 10th amendment rights, protecting its citizens, and safeguarding its jobs, and calling upon the Administration to act immediately to enforce our Nation's immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. HODES, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HALL of New York, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H. Res. 1381. A resolution recognizing the National Museum of American Jewish History, an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution, as the only museum in the Nation dedicated exclusively to exploring and preserving the American Jewish experience; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 1382. A resolution expressing sympathy to the families of those killed by North Korea in the sinking of the Republic of Korea Ship Cheonan, and solidarity with the Republic of Korea in the aftermath of this tragic incident; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H. Res. 1383. A resolution honoring Dr. Larry Case on his retirement as National FFA Advisor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 1384. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that State and local governments, and State and local law enforcement personnel in the course of carrying out routine duties, have the inherent authority of a sovereign entity to investigate, identify, apprehend, arrest, detain, or transfer to Federal custody aliens in the United States, for the purpose of assisting in the enforcement of the immigration laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself and Mr. MCKEON):

H. Res. 1385. A resolution recognizing and honoring the courage and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

283. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Resolution No. 643 urging the Congress to allocate \$2 billion of the next proposed economic stimulus to create an employment program throughout the year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

284. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 103 urging the Congress to pass legislation to fully fund forty percent of the costs of IDEA; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

285. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, relative to House Resolution 117 urging the Congress to require more healthful options for students under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

286. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Senate Resolution urging the Congress to adopt a more accurate measure and limita-

tion on the passage of Federal mandates on state and local governments; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

287. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 105 urging the Congress to undertake an immediate and thorough review of federal expenditures under the Equal Access to Justice Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 106 urging the Congress to add a Twenty-Eighth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

289. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Kansas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1615 claiming sovereignty under the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

290. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 104 urging the Congress to oppose federal legislation that interferes with a state's ability to direct the transport and processing of horses; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Agriculture.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 29: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 40: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.
H.R. 208: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 275: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 303: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois and Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 305: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
H.R. 510: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 622: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 673: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 848: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 873: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 949: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 988: Mr. BOREN and Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 1017: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1054: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1193: Mr. POLIS and Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 1250: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1255: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1351: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1352: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 1547: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1829: Mr. SALAZAR and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1961: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2067: Ms. KILROY and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 2109: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2222: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2273: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 2298: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2328: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2381: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2408: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2443: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2456: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 2565: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2575: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 2625: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2845: Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 2870: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2946: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2962: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 3240: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3251: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3301: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 3333: Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 3408: Mr. BACA, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3441: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3636: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3652: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3666: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 3668: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. JONES, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MAFFEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CAO, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. McMAHON.
H.R. 3715: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3745: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3974: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 4037: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4070: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 4072: Mr. LEE of New York.
H.R. 4085: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 4136: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 4150: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4199: Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 4233: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
H.R. 4278: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4299: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 4306: Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 4310: Mr. SABLON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HARE, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4354: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4386: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H.R. 4410: Mr. CAMP, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. ELLSWORTH.
H.R. 4525: Mr. TEAGUE.
H.R. 4530: Mr. MAFFEL.
H.R. 4544: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 4549: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 4684: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LATTI, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATSON, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4710: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4746: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 4806: Ms. DeLAURO and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 4807: Mr. MITCHELL.
H.R. 4843: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 4870: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4903: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 4943: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 4961: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4972: Mr. TERRY and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 4973: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 5000: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. WU.
H.R. 5012: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 5015: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 5029: Mr. FORBES, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 5032: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5034: Mr. PETERS and Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 5035: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 5040: Mr. PETERSON and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 5041: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ELLSWORTH, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 5065: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5081: Mr. CARTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 5091: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 5092: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. REYES, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CAMP, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. TANNER.
H.R. 5111: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CAO, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 5115: Mr. OBERSTAR.
H.R. 5121: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 5137: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. JONES, Mr. REBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SPACE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. DeGETTE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DRIEHAUS, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 5142: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 5143: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5156: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 5162: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 5175: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. CARNAHAN.
H.R. 5177: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
H.R. 5200: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
H.R. 5213: Ms. WATSON and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 5214: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5217: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 5226: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 5234: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5258: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
H.R. 5268: Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 5294: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 5295: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 5297: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 5298: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 5312: Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SHULER, and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 5319: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 5322: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 5324: Mr. ARCURI.
H.R. 5327: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. McCOTTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. FOX, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. LEE of New York, and Mr. LoBIONDO.
H.J. Res. 14: Mr. INGLIS.
H. Con. Res. 226: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. PENCE.
H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HARE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SPACE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. SIRE, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Con. Res. 267: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. McHENRY.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.
H. Res. 111: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 536: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. KILDEE.
H. Res. 764: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H. Res. 1073: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. HALVORSON.
H. Res. 1207: Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Res. 1226: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 1275: Mr. WELCH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HARE, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KOSMAS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H. Res. 1285: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 1302: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H. Res. 1309: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 1313: Mr. INGLIS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CAO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. TAYLOR.
H. Res. 1335: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 1346: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. REBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. DUNCAN.
H. Res. 1351: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. SHULER.
H. Res. 1365: Mr. COOPER and Mr. LAMBORN.
H. Res. 1366: Mr. SHULER.
H. Res. 1372: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LATTI, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H. Res. 1374: Mr. CAO.
H. Res. 1378: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. LEVIN

The House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4213, the American Jobs and Closing Tax Loopholes Act, contains the following limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(g) of rule XXI.

List of limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9, rule XXI:

1. Title VI contains a limited tariff benefit requested by Representative ETHERIDGE, initially introduced as H.R. 4136, a bill to extend the temporary duty suspensions on certain cotton shirting fabrics, and for other purposes.